

*IUSTOS AB INIUSTIS FIDELESQUE AB INFIDELIBUS
SEQUESTRARE ET MANIFESTE PROPALLARE: REGISTAR
NEVJERNIH I POLITIČKA KRIZA U SREDNJOVJEKOVNOJ
SLAVONIJI POČETKOM 15. STOLJEĆA*



*IUSTOS AB INIUSTIS FIDELESQUE AB INFIDELIBUS
SEQUESTRARE ET MANIFESTE PROPALLARE: THE REGISTER
OF REBELS AND POLITICAL CRISIS IN MEDIEVAL
SLAVONIA IN THE EARLY 15TH CENTURY*

Razumijevanje lokalnih prilika u srednjovjekovnoj Slavoniji u prvom desetljeću 15. stoljeća zapravo je nemoguće bez uvida u reperkusije krize koja je izbila 1402. i kulminirala iduće godine, odnosno bez uvida u načine na koje je pobjednička strana ponovno uspostavila svoj narušeni autoritet. U radu se stoga sagledavaju mehanizmi saniranja političke krize kroz prizmu uloge administrativnih praksi utemeljenih na pisanoj riječi u tom procesu, odnosno kroz prizmu registra nevjernih nastalog na općem shodu održanom u Križevcima krajem 1403. i početkom 1404. godine. Štoviše, potraga za slavonskim registrom nevjernih otvorila je uvid i u vrlo sličan mehanizam rješavanja posljedica krize 1403. i na razini čitave Ugarske, gdje je također, početkom drugog desetljeća 15. stoljeća, napravljen registar nevjernih. Oba dokumenta, makar nisu sačuvana, dragocjeni su stoga tragovi za razumijevanje funkcioniranja kraljevskog aparata početkom 15. stoljeća te za sagledavanje modaliteta interakcije lokalnih društava i političkog središta.

Ključne riječi: Sigismund; politička kriza; srednjovjekovna Slavonija; registar; shod.

It is practically impossible to understand the local state of affairs in the medieval Slavonia in the first decade of the 15th century without examining the repercussions of the crisis that began in 1402 and culminated the following year and the actions that the winning side took to restore its damaged authority. This is why the mechanisms used for resolving the political crisis are observed in this paper through the prism of the administrative practices reliant on the written word, specifically, through the prism of the “Register of Rebels” made at the General Assembly that took place in Križevci in the late 1403 and the early 1404. Indeed, the quest for the Slavonian register of rebels also yielded clues about the very similar crisis-resolving mechanism used in the Kingdom of Hungary, where a register of rebels was also made in the early second decade of the 15th century. Although not preserved, both documents are valuable for understanding the functioning of the royal apparatus in the early 15th century and for analyzing the modalities of interactions between local societies and the political center.

Keywords: Sigismund; political crisis; medieval Slavonia; register; assembly.

UVOD

Još je 1983. godine Petar Rokai u svojoj doktorskoj disertaciji utvrdio da je *congregatio generalis* održan 1403. u Križevcima potpuno zanemaren i u hrvatskoj i u mađarskoj historiografiji, a isto se može ustvrditi i za registar nevjernih koji je nastao na tom shodu.¹ Ni gotovo četrdeset godina kasnije u tom se pogledu nije promijenilo odveć mnogo. Shod i registar pojave se tu i tamo, tek na razini uzgredne primjedbe po pojedinim publikacijama.² Koji su mogući razlozi takve nezainteresiranosti, teško je razlučiti, no shod i registar od izvanrednog su značaja za razumijevanje političkih prilika koje su obilježile *Archiregnum Hungaricum* u prvom desetljeću 15. stoljeća. Razumijevanje lokalnih prilika u Slavoniji u prvom desetljeću 15. stoljeća zapravo je nemoguće bez uvida u reperkusije krize koja je izbila 1402. i kulminirala iduće godine, odnosno bez uvida u načine na koje je pobjednička strana ponovno uspostavila svoj narušeni autoritet. Nadalje, izrada registra nevjernih te primjeri njegova kasnijeg korištenja pružaju mogućnost sagledavanja saniranja političke krize kroz prizmu uloge administrativnih praksi utemeljenih na pisanoj riječi u tom procesu. Štoviše, potraga za slavonskim registrom nevjernih otvorila je uvid i u vrlo sličan mehanizam rješavanja posljedica krize 1403. i na razini čitave Ugarske, gdje je također, početkom drugog desetljeća 15. stoljeća, napravljen registar nevjernih. Oba dokumenta, makar nisu sačuvana, dragocjeni su stoga tragovi za razumijevanje funkcioniranja kraljevskog aparata početkom 15. stoljeća te za sagledavanje modaliteta interakcije lokalnih društava i političkog središta.

* Ovaj je rad sufinancirala Hrvatska zaklada za znanost projektom IP-2019-04-9315 „Anžuvinski archiregnum u srednjoistočnoj i jugoistočnoj Europi u 14. stoljeću: pogled s periferije“.

¹ Rokai 1983: 567–568. U radu koristim pojam *shod*, a ne *sabor*, kako se donekle ustalilo, jer je najbliži vernakularnom pojmu *sochodon*, čija je uporaba zasvjedočena u 14. stoljeću, na što je ukazao Ančić 1996: 68; Ančić 1987.

² Ančić 2009: 55–56.

INTRODUCTION

Back in 1983, Petar Rokai asserted in his doctoral thesis that the *congregatio generalis* that took place in Križevci in 1403 had been completely ignored by both Croatian and Hungarian historiographies and the same could be said for the Register of Rebels made at that assembly.¹ Almost forty years later, nothing much has changed in this regard. The assembly and register are mentioned now and then merely as footnotes in some publications.² It is hard to say what are the reasons for this lack of interest, but the assembly and register are very important for understanding the political state of affairs in the *Archiregnum Hungaricum* in the first decade of the 15th century. It is practically impossible to understand the local state of affairs in the medieval Slavonia in the first decade of the 15th century without examining the repercussions of the crisis that began in 1402 and culminated the following year and the actions that the winning side took to restore its damaged authority. Also, the making of the Register of Rebels and the examples of its subsequent use can help us understand the resolution of the political crisis through the prism of the administrative practices reliant on the written word. Indeed, the quest for the Slavonian register of rebels also yielded clues about the very similar crisis-resolving mechanism used in the Kingdom of Hungary, where a register of rebels was also made in the early second decade of the 15th century. Although not preserved, both documents are valuable for understanding the functioning of the royal apparatus in the early 15th century and for analyzing the modalities of interactions between local societies and the political center.

* The work on this paper was co-financed by the Croatian Science Foundation under the project IP-2019-04-9315 (*Angevin Archiregnum in East Central and Southeastern Europe in the 14th Century: View from the Periphery*).

¹ Rokai 1983: 567–568. In Croatian version of this paper, I am using the term *shod* for “assembly”, instead of *sabor*. While *sabor* is more often used, *shod* is closer to the vernacular term *sochodon* that was in use in the 14th century, as noted by Ančić 1996: 68; Ančić 1987.

² Ančić 2009: 55–56.

SLAVONIJA U BORBAMA ZA TRON TIJEKOM 1403.

Iako je nekoliko mjeseci 1401. proveo u zatočeništvu, čime mu je autoritet bio narušen, Sigismund se očigledno početkom 1402. godine, kada je napustio kraljevstvo, osjećao dovoljno sigurnim. Do kraja godine je, promjenama na čelnim pozicijama na dvoru te određivanjem Alberta IV. od Austrije za nasljednika i upravitelja kraljevstva tijekom svog izbjivanja, poduzeo korake koji su trebali učvrstiti njegovu vlast. No takvi potezi izazvali su protureakciju i široku koaliciju velikaša, koji su odlučili poduprijeti Ladislava Napuljskog za kralja, čiji su pobornici u krajevima južno od Save do kraja 1402. već kontrolirali gotovo cijelu Dalmaciju i Hrvatsku.³ Među onima koji su okrenuli leđa Sigismundu bio je i Emerik Bubek, vranski prior koji je sa zagrebačkim biskupom Eberhardom držao čast bana Slavonije, Dalmacije i Hrvatske u razdoblju od veljače 1402. do početka listopada, kada ih odmjenjuju Pavao Bissen i Ladislav Gordovai.⁴ Sva četvorica bila su prisutna u Požunu gdje je 21. rujna potpisan sporazum s Albertom IV. od Austrije, koji su, među ostalima, i oni ovjerali svojim pečatom.⁵ Tada je očigledno i donesena odluka o smjeni na banskoj časti, koja je međutim imala sasvim suprotne reakcije kod dvojice smijenjenih – dok je Eberhard i dalje čvrsto pristajao uz Sigismunda, za Emerika je micanje s banske časti dovelo do odluke o promjeni odanosti te on postaje pobornik Ladislava Napuljskog. U pravu je V. Klaić kada vijest Paulusa de Paula o zauzeću, to jest predaji Vrane 11. listopada Ladislavovim snagama, koje su je opsjedale od početka rujna, povezuje s promjenom Emerikove lojalnosti.⁶ Promjena strane Emerika Bubeka imala je velike reperkusije za političku lojalnost slavonskog plemstva, što se ogleda i u iskazu koji se javlja u

SLAVONIA AND THE STRUGGLE FOR THE THRONE IN 1403

Although the few months spent in captivity in 1401 damaged his authority, Sigismund nevertheless felt safe enough when he left the Kingdom in early 1402. By the end of that year he undertook the steps intended to tighten his grip on power: reshuffling the highest positions at the Court and appointing Albert IV of Austria his heir apparent and the caretaker of the Kingdom in his absence. However, these moves were met with counter-reaction of the nobility, who formed a wide coalition and decided to support Ladislaus of Naples as their king (by the end of 1402, his supporters had already controlled almost entire Dalmatia and Croatia).³ Among those who turned their back to Sigismund was Emeric Bebek, the Prior of Vrana who, together with Eberhard, Bishop of Zagreb, ruled as Ban of Slavonia, Dalmatia and Croatia from February to early October of 1402, when both of them were replaced by Paul of Bissen and Ladislaus Gordovai.⁴ All four of them attended the signing of the 21 September agreement with Albert IV of Austria in Bratislava and were among those who verified it with their seals.⁵ Clearly it was then that the decision about the replacement of the two Bans was made. Their reactions to it were different: while Eberhard remained firmly loyal to Sigismund, Emeric switched sides and became a supporter of Ladislaus of Naples. V. Klaić is right in associating Paulus de Paulo's news about the 11 October surrender of Vrana to Ladislaus' troops (that had sieged it since early September) with Emeric's change of loyalty.⁶ Emeric Bebek's switching sides had far-reaching repercussions on the political loyalty of Slavonian nobility, which is reflected in several Sigismund's charters alleging that Emeric "fere totius ipsius rebellionis et discensionis origo fuerat

³ Engel 2001: 206–207; Klaić 1985: 344–354; Šišić 1902: 137–154.

⁴ Engel 1996: 19.

⁵ Lővei 2009: 149–182.

⁶ Paulus veli da „castrum Vranae dedit se ipsi domino Aloysio capitaneo“ (Šišić 1904: 35); Klaić: 1985: 351, iako je argument kojim objašnjava promjenu Emerikova političkog stava teško održiv.

³ Engel 2001: 206–207; Klaić 1985: 344–354; Šišić 1902: 137–154.

⁴ Engel 1996: 19.

⁵ Lővei 2009: 149–182.

⁶ According to Paulus, “castrum Vranae dedit se ipsi domino Aloysio capitaneo” (Šišić 1904: 35); Klaić: 1985: 351, although the argument explaining the change of Emeric's political attitude is hardly viable.

nekoliko Sigismundovih isprava, prema kojem je Emerik „fere totius ipsius rebellionis et discensionis origo fuerat et causa efficiens“.⁷ O tome rječito svjedoči i velik broj onih plemića kojima su nakon studenog 1403. zbog nevjere oduzeti posjedi pri čemu je navedeno da su se nalazili u Emerikovoj službi (v. naprijed). Zbog različitih, iako ne nužno suprotstavljenih, iskaza u izvorima teško je razaznati je li sam Emerik osobno imao kakvu ulogu u zarobljavanju bana Pavla Bissena, koje se može kronološki smjestiti u veljaču 1403., što je također bio ozbiljan udarac Sigismundovim snagama na terenu.⁸

Što se događalo s banskom čašću u susljednom periodu? Vrlo je teško suditi o tome jer je izvorna građa oskudna, što je samo po sebi indikativno te govori o (ne)mogućnosti djelovanja bilo koje strane kroz standardne institucionalne poluge kojima se manifestirao i ostvarivao autoritet i vlast političkog središta na lokalnoj razini. Naime, za period između studenoga 1402. i kolovoza 1403. nije sačuvana ni jedna isprava koju je izdao slavonski ban, a znakovita je i praznina u onima koje su izdali vicebanovi – sačuvanih isprava izdanih u njihovo ime nema između rujna 1402. i svibnja 1403.⁹ Jednako tako, gotovo da i nema sačuvanih isprava Zagrebačkog ili Čazmanskog kaptola koje bi svojim sadržajem ukazale na komunikaciju s dvorom, što je u razdoblju mira bio jedan od standardnih mehanizama uređenja lokalnih prilika.¹⁰ Iako to

et causa efficiens“.⁷ Evidence of it can be seen in the fact that there were many noblemen whose estates were taken away from them after November 1403 on account of their disloyalty, manifested by their support for Emeric (see further). As the accounts in the sources vary, although they are not necessarily opposing, it is hard to tell whether Emeric was personally involved in the capturing of Ban Paul of Bissen (dated to February 1403), which was a serious blow to Sigismund's forces in the field.⁸

So how was the authority of *ban* exerted in the subsequent period? It is very hard to say because sources are scarce – which, in fact, indicates that none of the parties involved was able to act by using the standard institutional levers through which the political center exercised authority and power on the local level. No charter issued by Ban of Slavonia between November 1402 and August 1403 has been preserved. There is a similar gap when we are talking about charters issued by vicebans – none of them from the period between September 1402 and May 1403 has been preserved.⁹ Charters of Zagreb or Čazma Chapters that would indicate communication with the Court – one of standard mechanisms for regulating local state of affairs in times of peace – are also practically non-existent.¹⁰ While it does not mean that bans and vicebans (both those appointed by Sigismund and those appointed by Ladislaus) were not active at the time, it nevertheless suggests that insecurity reigned

⁷ Šišić 1938: 232, 304.

⁸ Za različite verzije v. Ančić 2009: 70, bilj. 72.

⁹ Zaključak izveden na temelju isprava dostupnih *online* zahvaljujući Mađarskom državnom arhivu i projektu *Hungaricana* te ZsO, I. Za slavonske banove v.

https://archives.hungaricana.hu/en/charters/search/results/?list=eyJxdWVyeSI6ICJLSUFEPShTWkxBlx1MDB-kM04gQlxlMDBjMU4pIiwgInNvcnQiOiAiUkVDTIV-NIn0&per_page=100&page=6. Na primjer Ladislav od Gordove, koji je u listopadu 1402. postao banom, očigledno je u tom razdoblju držao bansku čast, što se vidi iz dvaju dokumenata iz svibnja 1403., no nemoguće je razaznati išta o njegovim aktivnostima u Slavoniji, ZsO, II/1, 286, dok. 2422, 287 dok. 2428. Za vicebanove v.

https://archives.hungaricana.hu/en/charters/search/results/?list=eyJxdWVyeSI6ICJLSUFEPShTWkxBlx1MDB-kM04gVklDRUJcdTAwYzFOKSI6ICJzb3J0IjogIjJFQ05VT-SJ9&per_page=100 te također ZsO II/1.

¹⁰ Jedna od rijetkih je ona Čazmanskog kaptola koji prima Sigismundov nalog u ožujku 1403., Mažuran 2002: 254.

⁷ Šišić 1938: 232, 304.

⁸ For varied versions, see Ančić 2009: 70, n. 72.

⁹ A conclusion based on the documents available online owing to the Hungarian State Archives and project *Hungaricana* and ZsO, I. For bans of Slavonia, see

https://archives.hungaricana.hu/en/charters/search/results/?list=eyJxdWVyeSI6ICJLSUFEPShTWkxBlx1MDB-kM04gQlxlMDBjMU4pIiwgInNvcnQiOiAiUkVDTIV-NIn0&per_page=100&page=6. For example, Ladislaus of Gordova, who had become *ban* in October 1402, clearly held this post in this period, as can be seen in two documents from May 1403. However, it is impossible to conclude anything about his activities in Slavonia, ZsO, II/1, 286, doc. 2422, 287 doc. 2428. For vicebans, see

https://archives.hungaricana.hu/en/charters/search/results/?list=eyJxdWVyeSI6ICJLSUFEPShTWkxBlx1MDB-kM04gVklDRUJcdTAwYzFOKSI6ICJzb3J0IjogIjJFQ05VT-SJ9&per_page=100, and also ZsO II/1.

¹⁰ One of the rare such documents is the one of Čazma Chapter, confirming a Sigismund order of March 1403, Mažuran 2002: 254.

ne znači da djelatnosti banova i vicebanova (kako onih Sigismundovih tako i Ladislavovih) nije bilo, sve to ipak ukazuje na posvemašnju nesigurnost na prostoru Slavonije i na narušavanje ustaljenih administrativnih struktura i praksi. Nažalost, u tom kontekstu teško je razaznati političke prilike u Slavoniji; prve sigurnije informacije stižu s početka travnja 1403. Tada su se, naime, u Slatini okupili *prelati, barones, proceres et nobiles regni*, Ladislavovi pobornici, o čijim aktivnostima govori još jedna isprava izdana u njihovo ime 24. svibnja u blizini Požege *in descensu nostro exercituali*.¹¹ Put do Zadra, gdje su se trebali susresti s Ladislavom Napuljskim, prirodno ih je vodio preko Slavonije gdje su tadašnje prilike uključivale i vojno djelovanje. S obzirom na prethodno istaknutu vrlo oskudnu građu za taj period, oslonac u pokušaju rekonstrukcije tih sukoba, to jest razvoja političkih odnosa, moguće je naći tek u kasnijim Sigismundovim darovnicama. To pak znači da dobivamo jednostrane iskaze koji ne samo da bilježe podatke s vremenskim odmakom već ih bilježe tako da je vrlo teško uspostaviti kronološki slijed događaja koji se opisuju. Uz te ograde može se zaključiti da je Sigismundove interese u međurječju, to jest u Slavoniji, prvenstveno zastupao Ivan Marot, o čemu govori nekoliko narativnih dijelova njemu izdanih darovnica. Najbolje je pritom krenuti od darovnice iz studenoga 1405., gdje se veli da je Emerik Bubek tražio pomoć od neprijateljskih regija i na svoju stranu privukao mnoštvo slavonskih plemića

in Slavonia and that well-established administrative structures and practices were disrupted. Unfortunately, the political state of affairs in Slavonia in this period is hard to see clearly. The first solid facts date from early April 1403, when *prelati, barones, proceres et nobiles regni*, Ladislaus' supporters, gathered in Slatina. A charter issued in their name near Požega on 24 May *in descensu nostro exercituali* tells us about their activities.¹¹ Naturally, the route to Zadar, where they were supposed to meet Ladislaus of Naples, led through Slavonia, where the situation at the time was such that military actions could not be ruled out. As the contemporaneous sources that cast light on this period are very scarce (as has been said above), we have to rely on Sigismund's donations from a later period to be able to understand these conflicts and political developments. However, this means relying on one-sided accounts that not only record events after a lapse of time but do it in a way that makes it hard to establish the chronology of these events. With these reservations in mind, one can conclude that Sigismund's interests in Slavonia were primarily represented by John of Maroth, according to some narrative parts of the royal donations issued to him. It is best to begin with the donation issued in November 1405. It states that Emeric Bebek turned to hostile regions for help and managed to enlist in his cause numerous Slavonian noblemen. After John of Maroth had successfully stood up against Bebek's forces, he rushed to Bratislava where the king was staying in

¹¹ Klaić 1985: 354. Tko je bio u Slatini, dijelom se može rekonstruirati na temelju pečata pričvršćenih na tamo izdanoj ispravi, kojih je nekoć bilo 51, dok ih je danas ostalo sačuvano 46. Zahvaljujući projektu kolega sa Sveučilišta u Debrecenu „Magyarország a középkori Európában“, u bazi podataka vezanoj za projekt, između ostalog, moguć je uvid u fotografije i opise pečata (putem signature AGADW 5542), za koje se također daje i identifikacija njihovih vlasnika, gdje je to bilo moguće (što je učinio Ádám Novák). Zahvaljujući tome znamo da su u Slatini bili prisutni ostrogonski nadbiskup Ivan Kaniški, kaločki nadbiskup Ivan Szepesi, varadski biskup Lukács Órévi, egerski biskup Toma Ludányi, đurski biskup Ivan Hédervári, erdeljski biskup Stjepan Upori, profesor sveučilišta u Obudi Benedikt Makrai, transilvanijske vojvode Nikola Csák i Nikola Marcali, bivši palatin Detrik Bebek, tavernik Nikola Kaniški, Juraj ili Stjepan Jakcs (Kusalyi), Ivan Szécsi, Andrija Henrikov Rohonci, Ivan Tomin Rupolyi, Ladislav Töttös od Bathmonostora, Mihovil Stjepanov Mikolai, Ivan Grgurov Alsáni te Filip Korodški.

¹¹ Klaić 1985: 354. The seals attached to the document issued at the occasion (it used to be 51 of them but only 46 have been preserved) can help us identify some of those who attended the Slatina meeting. As the database of the *Magyarország a középkori Európában* project carried out by colleagues from the University of Debrecen contains photos and descriptions of these seals (document number AGADW 5542), specifying their owners wherever possible (thanks to Ádám Novák), it is known that the following dignitaries were present in Slatina: John of Kanizsa (Archbishop of Esztergom), John Szepesi (Archbishop of Kalocsa), Lukács Órévi (Bishop of Várad), Thomas Ludányi (Bishop of Eger), John Hédervári (Bishop of Győr), Stephen Upori (Bishop of Erdély), Benedict Makrai (a university professor from Óbuda), Nicholas Csák and Nicholas Marcali (Transilvanian voivodes), Detrik Bebek (former palatine), Nicholas of Kanizsa (*magister tavarnicorum*), George or Stephen Jakcs (Kusalyi), John Szécsi, Andrew Rohonci (son of Henry), John Rupolyi (son of Thomas), Ladislaus Töttös of Bathmonostor, Michael Mikolai (son of Stephen), John Alsáni (son of George) and Philip Kórógyi.

te sakupio vojsku kojoj se uspješno suprotstavio Ivan Marot, nakon čega je pak pohitao kralju prema Bratislavi, gdje se kralj nalazio krajem srpnja i početkom kolovoza.¹² Sukobi se, dakle, mogu datirati negdje u lipanj i srpanj, a ako je vjerovati sadržaju kraljevske darovnice, Marot je u njima bio uspješan.¹³ Dapače, u darovnici Ivanu Marotu iz studenoga 1403. veli se da je Ivan uspio razbiti Emerikovu vojsku i odbaciti ga „de regno Sclavonie ad regnum Bozne“. Štoviše, Ivan je svojim djelovanjem neke od Emerikovih pobornika zatro, dok je druge vratio na put vjernosti pravom kralju, na oba načina urušavajući podršku Ladislavu Napuljskom i njegovim pobornicima.¹⁴ Nemoguće je biti održašiti u tvrdnji da se to dogodilo u lipnju, to jest srpnju, no sličnosti u iskazu darovnica, a koje to smještaju u period nakon što je Pavao Bissen zarobljen, to jest predan Ladislavu Napuljskom koji je u Dalmaciju stigao sredinom srpnja, sugeriraju to kao najtočniju vremensku odrednicu. Osim Ivana Marota izgleda da je u tim sukobima sudjelovao i Nikola Gorjanski za kojeg se kaže da je pokušao osloboditi Pavla Bissena, na što ga je Emerik, bježeći pred Nikolom, odveo u Zadar.¹⁵ Ako se pođe od toga da su Marot i Gorjanski bili uspješni u vojnim djelovanjima, postavlja se pitanje kontrole nad Slavonijom u ljeto 1403. Jer, nasuprot slici političkih odnosa i uspjeha kakvu ocrtavaju Sigismundove isprave, stoji informacija koja je 24. srpnja zabilježena u pismu Firentinca Galeota koji gradu Firenci daje izvješće o prilikama u kraljevstvu, u kojem se govori da se

late June and early July.¹² This is why the conflicts can be dated to June and/or July of that year. If the donation is to be believed, John of Maroth was successful in these conflicts.¹³ Corroborating this, a donation to Marot from November 1403 states that he managed to repulse the enemy “de regno Sclavonie ad regnum Bozne”. Indeed, John annihilated some of Emeric’s supporters and won over others, switching their loyalty back to the “true” king. Both of these courses of action weakened support to Ladislaus of Naples and his advocates.¹⁴ We cannot say with absolute certainty that this took place in June and/or July. However, the similarity of the accounts in these two donations that place these events in the period after Paul of Bissen was taken prisoner and handed over to Ladislaus of Naples (who had arrived in Dalmatia in mid-July) suggests it is most likely that the events took place in this particular period. Aside from John of Maroth, it seems that Nicholas Garai also participated in the conflict. He is claimed to have attempted to free Paul of Bissen from captivity, but Emeric, who was fleeing from Nicholas, took Paul to Zadar.¹⁵ If John of Maroth and Nicholas Garai were indeed successful in their military campaigns, the question arises who was in control of Slavonia in summer 1403. A depiction contrary to the political situation and achievements described in Sigismund’s charters can be found in Florentine citizen Galeotto’s letter to the Florence authorities on 24 July. In this letter he reports on the state of the affairs in the *Archiregnum*, explaining that the entire region south of the Drava River recognizes Ladislaus as its king and that those few who defy him

¹² Engel & Tóth, 2005: 80; Dvořáková, 2010: 89.

¹³ Šišić 1938: 260.

¹⁴ Šišić 1938: 232–233.

¹⁵ Šišić 1938: 282–283. Još se od Šišićeve primjedbe spominje da je Nikola Gorjanski oslobodio Pavla Bissena (Šišić 1904: 37, bilj. 139) što, na primjer, ponavlja i D. Lovrenović 2006: 126, bilj. 45. Međutim, u ispravi na koju se poziva Šišić stoji da je Gorjanski to pokušao, no da je Emerik odveo Pavla u Zadar (Šišić 1938: 283), pa je nemoguće Pavlovo oslobođenje smjestiti u ljeto 1403. Kako se i kada Pavao Bissen na kraju oslobodio zatočeništva, teško je pouzdano reći. U kasnijoj darovnici samo se kaže da je oslobođen božanskom naklonošću nakon čega ga je kralj vratio na bansku čast („postremoque diuina volente disposizione memorato Paulo bano de huiusmodi sua captiuitate liberato et per nostram maiestatem ad honorem sui banatus restituito“, I. Mažuran 2002: 310).

¹² Engel & Tóth, 2005: 80; Dvořáková, 2010: 89.

¹³ Šišić 1938: 260.

¹⁴ Šišić 1938: 232–233.

¹⁵ Šišić 1938: 282–283. Ever since Šišić’s comment, it has been alleged that Nicholas Garai freed Paul of Bissen (Šišić 1904: 37, n. 139), including in D. Lovrenović 2006: 126, n. 45. However, in the document Šišić refers to it is claimed that Nicholas Garai only attempted it, but that Emeric had taken Paul to Zadar (Šišić 1938: 283). For this reason, it is impossible to place Paul’s release in summer 1403. When and how was Paul of Bissen actually released from captivity, it is hard to say. A later royal donation merely states that he was released by divine grace, after which King reinstated him as Ban (“postremoque diuina volente disposizione memorato Paulo bano de huiusmodi sua captiuitate liberato et per nostram maiestatem ad honorem sui banatus restituito“, I. Mažuran 2002: 310).

Ladislavu podvrgavaju svi južno od rijeke Drave, a mali broj onih koji mu se suprotstavljaju, nisu velike snage.¹⁶ Koje je pak od tih viđenja političkih odnosa bliže stvarnosti, nemoguće je reći, no ne treba isključiti mogućnost fluktuiranja u kontroli i podršci koju je pojedina strana imala u Slavoniji. Pritom se, iz Sigismundova opisa djelovanja Ivana Marota, može razaznati da su vojne pobjede i iskazi vojne sile silno utjecali na raspoloženje lokalnog plemstva i na njihovu političku lojalnost. Lojalnost se nastojalo očuvati i pozitivnom agitacijom, u kakvu spada i darovnica Emerika Bubečka Adamu i Ladislavu od Čanjevca od 20. kolovoza, izdana u Križevcima, koja još jednom otkriva Emerika Bubečka kao glavnog logističara Ladislavove stranke na prostoru Slavonije.¹⁷

Ako je do rujna 1403. postojalo snažno djelovanje Sigismundovih protivnika uslijed kojeg je došlo do Ladislavove krunidbe u Zadru, M. Ančić zgodno primjećuje da je krunidba bila „antiklimaks svih njihovih (ugarskih velikaša i prelata, op. a.) planova i značila je stvarni poraz pa je, uz još poneki trzaj u održavanju pobunjeničke strukture i hijerarhije tijekom ljetnih mjeseci, za njih pobuna okončana u jesen kada je Sigismund svima ponudio amnestiju“.¹⁸ No prije same amnestije kraljevske su snage izvojevale niz važnih pobjeda koje su dodatno omekšale otpor „pobunjenika“ i otvorile put prema ponudi amnestije koja će, kako će se pokazati, razriješiti krizu.¹⁹ Jesu li se neke od tih borbi odigravale u Slavoniji? Oslonac je potrebno opet tražiti u oskudnim informacijama Sigismundovih darovnica. Jedna od njih spominje ranjavanje Ivana Marota u sukobima pod utvrdom Emerika Bubečka poznatom po imenu *Tornow*, koja se nalazila negdje između Nove Gradiške i Okučana. Tom je prilikom Ivan Marot teže ranjen u glavu.²⁰ Pretpostavljam da

pose no real threat.¹⁶ It is impossible to say which of these perceptions of the political situation was closer to the truth, but the possibility of fluctuations in the control by and support to either of the conflicting parties in Slavonia cannot be ruled out. It is also clear that the military victories and demonstrations of power had a strong effect on the sentiment and political loyalty of the local nobility, as can be seen in Sigismund's description of John of Maroth's actions. Another way of ensuring their loyalty was positive agitation, such as Emeric Bebek's donation to Adam and Ladislaus of Čanjevac, issued in Križevci on 20 August, which once again presents Emeric Bebek as the chief logistician of Ladislaus' party in Slavonia.¹⁷

Even if until September 1403 Sigismund's opponents worked hard to overthrow and defeat him, even crowning Ladislaus in Zadar, M. Ančić perceptively observes that the coronation was the “anticlimax of their [Hungarian aristocrats' and prelates'] plans, effectively signaling their defeat; notwithstanding some further efforts to uphold the structure and hierarchy of the rebel camp during the summer months, their revolt was terminated in autumn, when Sigismund offered amnesty to them.”¹⁸ But before the amnesty, the king's forces won several important battles that helped overcome the rebels' resistance and pave the way for the amnesty that, as it would turn out, would resolve the crisis.¹⁹ Did any of these battles take place in Slavonia? We should once again resort to the scarce information from Sigismund's donations. According to one of them, John of Maroth was wounded under Emeric Bebek's fortress known as *Tornow*, that stood somewhere between Nova Gradiška and Okučani, where he received a severe wound on the head.²⁰ I presume

¹⁶ Šišić 1938: 209–210.

¹⁷ Šišić 1938: 215.

¹⁸ Ančić 2009: 74.

¹⁹ Za pismo Šišić 1938: 219; za sukobe Sigismundovih snaga Engel 2001: 207–208; Hoensch 1996: 112–113; Dvořáková 2010: 91–93; Šišić 1902: 163–164.

²⁰ Za identifikaciju utvrde v. Engel, 1996, 446 te Engel 2001a: 294; ona P. Rokaija da je riječ o mjestu Trnovo u Lici daleko je slabije argumentirana; također, njegovo izlaganje, makar razmatra vojne aktivnosti Ivana Marota tijekom 1403., nije moglo ovdje poslužiti jer im autor ne pokušava dati točniju vremensku odrednicu, Rokai 1983: 146–153.

¹⁶ Šišić 1938: 209–210.

¹⁷ Šišić 1938: 215.

¹⁸ Ančić 2009: 74.

¹⁹ For the letter, see Šišić 1938: 219; for the battles of Sigismund's forces, see Engel 2001: 207–208; Hoensch 1996: 112–113; Dvořáková 2010: 91–93; Šišić 1902: 163–164.

²⁰ For identification of the exact location of the fortress, see Engel, 1996, 446 and Engel 2001a: 294; P. Rokai's suggestion that it was in Trnovo in Lika is much less substantiated; also, while the author analyzes the military activities of John of Maroth in 1403, his exposition could not be used here because the author did not attempt to determine the exact dates of the events, Rokai 1983: 146–153.

je do sukoba moglo doći nakon što se Ivan vratio sa sjevera Ugarske gdje je bio pošao ka kralju u Bratislavu, dakle negdje tijekom kasnog kolovoza ili rujna. Zadobivena ozljeda također objašnjava zašto ga neko vrijeme ne vidimo u vojnim djelovanjima, a inače je bio jedan od ključnih Sigismundovih vojskovođa u cijelom razdoblju krize njegove vlasti. Na samom kraju mjeseca, 30. rujna, u jednom pismu Dubrovčanima Sigismund najavljuje pohod prema Slavoniji gdje se planirao sukobiti sa svojim neprijateljima, no do toga ipak nije došlo – u susretu s pobunjenicima početkom listopada postignut je sporazum koji je rezultirao izdavanjem kraljevske povelje od 8. listopada.²¹

OD PONUDE KRALJEVSKOG OPROSTA DO REGISTRA NEVJERNIH

Tom poveljom zapravo je, kao i u Pápi 29. listopada 1401., ponuđeno pomilovanje kraljevim protivnicima.²² No, naspram situaciji u listopadu 1401., kada mu je nakon puštanja iz zatvora položaj još bio uzdrman, ponuda dvije godine kasnije otkriva daleko odlučnijeg vladara koji je naumio pružiti ruku pomirbe svojim protivnicima, ali pod točno utvrđenim uvjetima. Da bi stekli kraljevsku milost – vrijedi primijetiti da je takav rječnik potpuno odsutan u povelji iz Pápe – pobunjenici su trebali prestati s neprijateljstvima te se podložiti kralju, čime im se garantirao oprost prijašnjih zlodjela te vraćanje posjeda. Osim toga trebali su se u roku od jedne godine pojaviti pred kraljem da bi iskazali svoju vjernost, o čemu bi bila izdana i kraljevska povelja o milosti. Za one pak koji su i nakon isteka roka – u slučaju krajeva južno od Drave u roku od 15 dana – nastavili s neprijateljstvima, kraljevska milost nije vrijedila te nisu mogli izbjeći osudu za svoja „zlodjela“.²³ Čak su i oni poput Bebeke i Kaniških koji nisu u dogovorenom roku prihvatili kraljevsku ponudu, ipak to učinili do kraja listopada, što međutim ne znači da su svi uspjeli steći kraljevsku milost. Od samog kraja listopada, to jest početka studenoga, počinje cijeli niz kraljevskih darovnica kojima se kraljevi

that the battle took place after John came back from northern Hungary, where he had gone on his way to the king in Bratislava. This would place the battle in late August or September. John's wounding could explain why he took no part in military activities for a while (he had been one of Sigismund's leading generals during the crisis of his rule). On 30 September, Sigismund wrote a letter to Dubrovnik authorities, announcing a campaign against his enemies in Slavonia. But it never happened – in early October he reached an agreement with the rebels, declaring it in a royal charter of 8 October.²¹

FROM THE OFFER OF ROYAL PARDON TO THE REGISTER OF REBELS

Just like in Pápa on 29 October 1401, the charter offered royal pardon to the king's opponents.²² But unlike in October 1401, when his position was still shaky after his release from prison, the offer of pardon two years later reveals a much resolute ruler who intends to make peace with his opponents, but under strictly defined conditions. In order to be restored to royal grace (indicatively, such vocabulary cannot be found in the Pápa charter), the rebels had to cease hostilities and submit themselves to their king; the pardon for their previous misdeeds and regaining their estates would thus be guaranteed. They also had to appear before the king within a year in order to manifest their loyalty to him, upon which a charter of royal pardon would be issued. Royal pardon was not to be granted to those who fail to cease hostilities after expiry of the deadline (15 days for those from the areas south of the Drava River) and there would be no way for them to avoid sentence for their "misdeeds".²³ The ones like Bebek and members of the Kanizsai family, who failed to accept royal pardon on time, did that by the end of October. However, it does not mean all of Sigismund's enemies managed to be restored to royal grace. Late October and early November saw a flood of royal donations rewarding the king's supporters with the estates of those who had persisted in their revolt. Many of

²¹ Šišić 1938: 215.

²² Dóry 1976: 175–179; Šišić 1938: 177–178.

²³ Dóry 1976: 175–179.

²¹ Šišić 1938: 215.

²² Dóry 1976: 175–179; Šišić 1938: 177–178.

²³ Dóry 1976: 175–179.

pobornici nagrađuju posjedima onih koji su ustrajali u pobuni, a među njima nemali je broj onih koji se tiču Slavonije. Tako je Nikola, sin Martina *de Seremio*, familijar Stjepana, sina Grgura *de Berench*, dobio posjede *Zenthmiklos* i *Buthkafelde* u Križevačkoj županiji, koji su pripadali Baltazaru, Petru, Jakovu, Filipu i Demetru, sinovima Konrada *de Buthkafelde*, a koji su se borili u banderiju priora Emerika.²⁴ Nadalje, 2. listopada izdana je darovnica u korist prethodno spomenutog Stjepana *de Berench* te preko njega banu Pavlu Bissenu, Nikoli Bissenu *de Hord* te Petru *de Ezdege*, koji su dobili posjede Demetrija i Jurja sinova Grgura od Međurića, koji su bili familijari priora Emerika.²⁵ Literat Pavao, sin Lovre *de Zenthandras* koji se borio pod banderijem bana Ladislava, sina Ladislava od Gordove, a preko njega i njegovi sinovi Nikola i Stjepan te Grgur Ivanov *de Pongrachouch*, dobili su posjede Ladislava Nikolina *de Zenthiwan* koji je bio u banderiju priora Emerika.²⁶ Nadalje, Ladislav Nikolín od Kreštelovca, koji se nalazio u banderiju Nikole Gorjanskog, 4. studenoga dobiva posjede Jakova Gallicusa *de Orbowa*, Andrije, Franje i Konrada, Lukinih sinova, te Ivana, sina potonjeg Andrije *de Hrusowch*, Nikole, Ugrinovog sina, Benedikta, Dominika i Bolete, Valentinovih sinova, Samsona, sina Jurja sina istog Valentina od Kreštelovca, te Benedikta, sina Petra od Voćina, koji su bili familijari priora Emerika i kaločkog nadbiskupa Ivana.²⁷ Petog studenoga kraljevskom su ispravom oduzeti posjedi Jakovu, sinu Blagonje *de Kapolna*, nekoć *de Kamarcha*, koji je bio u banderiju kaločkog nadbiskupa, a dobio ih je *miles egregius* Matija zvan Zaz *de Tomasouch* koji se borio u kraljevskom banderiju.²⁸ Istog dana i Ivan Marot dobio je posjede Nikole, Ivana i Benedikta Demetrijevih, Pavla Nikolina, Ladislava i Ivana Stjepanovih Pekrija.²⁹ Šestog studenoga Dominik, sin Tome sin Beke *de Dobouech et Sabnicha* iz Križevačke županije, familijar priora Emerika, koji je

they were in Slavonia. For example, Nicholas of *Seremio*, son of Martin, the *familiaris* (retainer) of Stephen of *Berench* (son of Gregory), was awarded the *Zenthmiklos* and *Buthkafelde* estates in Križevci County that once belonged to Balthasar, Jacob, Philip and Demetrius of *Buthkafelde*, sons of Korhardus, who had fought in Prior Emeric's *banderium*.²⁴ By a royal donation of 2 October, the above-mentioned Stephen of *Berench* and, through him, Ban Paul of Bissen of Hord and Peter of Özdöge, were awarded the former estates of Demetrius and George, sons of Gregory of Međurić, the retainers of Prior Emeric.²⁵ Paul *litteratus*, son of Lawrence of *Zenthandras*, who had fought in the *banderium* of Ban Ladislaus (son of Ladislaus of Gordova), and through him his sons Nicholas and Stephen, and Gregory of *Pongrachouch* (son of John), were awarded the former estates of Ladislaus of *Zenthiwan* (son of Nicolas), who had been in Prior Emeric's *banderium*.²⁶ On 4 November, Ladislaus of Kreštelovac (son of Nicholas), a member of Nicholas Garai's *banderium*, was awarded the former estates of Jacob Gallicus of *Orbowa*, Andrew, Francis and Conrad (sons of Luke), John of *Hrusowch* (son of the aforementioned Andrew), Nicholas (son of Ugrin), Benedict, Dominic and Boleta (sons of Valentin), Samson (son of George who, in turn, was the son of the aforementioned Valentin of Kreštelovac), and Benedict (son of Peter of Voćin), all of them retainers of Prior Emeric and John, Bishop of Kalocsa.²⁷ By a royal charter of 5 November, estates were taken away from Jacob of *Kapolna* (son of Blagonja, formerly of *Kamarcha*), a member of the *banderium* of Bishop of Kalocsa, and were awarded to *miles egregius* Mathew *de Tomasouch* (called Zaz), who had fought in the king's *banderium*.²⁸ On the same day, John of Maroth was awarded the estates of Nicholas, John and Benedict (sons of Demetrius), Paul (son of Nicholas) and Ladislaus and John Pekri (sons of Stephen).²⁹ On 6 November, Dominic (son of Thomas, son of

²⁴ ZsO, II/1, dok. 2680, str. 312.

²⁵ Mažuran 2002: 264–265.

²⁶ MNL OL, DL 100328.

²⁷ Šišić 1938: 225–226.

²⁸ MNL OL, DF 230834.

²⁹ MNL OL, DL 8901.

²⁴ ZsO, II/1, doc. 2680, p. 312.

²⁵ Mažuran 2002: 264–265.

²⁶ MNL OL, DL 100328.

²⁷ Šišić 1938: 225–226.

²⁸ MNL OL, DF 230834.

²⁹ MNL OL, DL 8901.

bio i njegov župan Dubice 1403.³⁰, izgubio je posjede koji su darovani Andriji, Pavlu i Stjepanu, sinovima Beke *de Zawersa* te Nikoli literatu, Tomi, Stjepanu i Ivanu, sinovima Petra *de Zadorfalwa*, familijarima Nikole Totha Susedgradskog i Mučina Lipovečkog.³¹ Sedmog je pak studenoga kralj dao posjedovne čestice pobunjenika Pavla *de Beche* u Križevačkoj županiji Mikecu *de Zenthpeter*.³²

Valja istaknuti da su to tek neki sačuvani primjeri koji otkrivaju pobunjenike u Slavoniji na temelju prvog vala kraljevskih darivanja oduzetih posjeda; broj je, što će se vidjeti u daljnjem izlaganju, bio daleko veći, no zajedničke su im dvije stvari. Kao prvo, najveći dio njih pratio je priora Emerika Bubeka, što potvrđuje optužbe na njegov račun u Sigismundovim darovnicama, to jest otkriva ga kao glavnog vođu i organizatora Ladislavove stranke u Slavoniji. Kao prior od 1392., zahvaljujući i materijalnim resursima reda kojem je stajao na čelu i banskoj časti tijekom 1402., Emerik je mogao stvoriti gustu mrežu klijenata u Slavoniji koju je onda mogao aktivirati u trenutcima sukoba, a služio je i kao stup za sve one koji su se iz drugih razloga protivili Sigismundovoj vlasti. Kao drugo, gotovo svi koji su izgubili posjede dolaze iz Križevačke županije, iznimno je malo onih iz Zagrebačke.³³ To može biti povezano s nekoliko činjenica, a prva je smještaj glavnih posjeda priorata, kojih nema na prostoru Zagrebačke županije.³⁴ Nadalje, jedan od najvećih slavonskih zemljoposjednika, zagrebački biskup, pozicija koju je tada držao Eberhard, cijelo je vrijeme pristajao uz Sigismunda, a aktivnu su mu podršku izgleda davali i ranije spomenuti plemići od Zomzedvara i Lipovečki. Kad su u pitanju druge važne obitelji s posjedima u Zagrebačkoj županiji, poput Blagajskih i Zrinskih, njihovu je političku odanost teško razaznati, prvenstveno jer granica između kraljevskih pristaša i pobunjenika nije bila neprobojna, ali u ovom je

Beke *de Dobouech et Sabnich* from Križevci County), Prior Emeric's retainer who had also been his count of Dubica County in 1403,³⁰ lost his estates to Andrew, Paul and Stephen (sons of Beke *de Zawersa*) and to Nicholas *litteratus*, Thomas and John (sons of Peter of *Zadorfalwa*), retainers of Nicholas Toth of Susedgrad and Mučin of Lipovec.³¹ On 7 November, the king awarded to Mikec of *Zenthpeter* the former landed properties of rebel Paul of *Beche* in Križevci County.³²

These are but a few preserved examples of the first wave of royal donations of confiscated estates, identifying rebels in Slavonia. There were much more of them, as we will see further in the text. They all had two things in common. First, most of them were Emeric Bebek's followers, which confirms the accusations against him found in Sigismund's donations and identifies him as the chief leader and organizer of Ladislaus' party in Slavonia. Thanks to the material resources he had had at his disposal as prior since 1392 and *ban* in 1402, Emeric managed to create a dense client network in Slavonia, to be activated in the times of conflicts. He also served as a linchpin for all those opposed to Sigismund's rule for other reasons. Second, almost all those who lost their estates were from Križevci County; very few of them were from Zagreb County.³³ One of the reasons for this may be the fact that none of the Priory's principal estates were located in Zagreb County.³⁴ Also, Bishop of Zagreb (then Eberhard), as one of the biggest landowners in Slavonia, had been supporting Sigismund all the time. The above-mentioned nobles from Susedgrad and Lipovec also seemed to have actively supported Sigismund. As for other important families with estates in Zagreb County – such as Zrinski and Blagaj families – their political loyalties are hard to tell, primarily because the line between the king's supporters and the rebels was not such a strict one. However, in

³⁰ Engel 1996: 82.

³¹ MNL OL, DF 230836, 230835.

³² MNL OL, DF 230838.

³³ Za Zagrebačku županiju v. opasku kod Miljan 2015: 196; dok za plemstvo Križevačke v. impresivnu studiju Pálosfalvi 2014, naročito zaključak na 342–343.

³⁴ Za utvrde reda v. kartu kod Hunyadi 2010: 66.

³⁰ Engel 1996: 82.

³¹ MNL OL, DF 230836, 230835.

³² MNL OL, DF 230838.

³³ For Zagreb County, see the remark in Miljan 2015: 196; for Križevci County nobility, see the impressive study Pálosfalvi 2014, particularly the conclusion on pp. 342–343.

³⁴ For the fortresses of the Order, see the map in Hunyadi 2010: 66.

kontekstu najvažnije da nisu odveć otvoreno radili protiv Sigismunda.³⁵

Bez obzira na te razlike između Zagrebačke i Križevačke županije prethodne su kraljevske darovnice sa samog kraja listopada ili početka studenoga na diskurzivnoj razini govorile o Slavoniji kao o cjelini te su je suprotstavljale Hrvatskoj i Dalmaciji, za koje se naglašava da su u potpunosti izvan dometa Sigismundova autoriteta. No ni sama Slavonija izgleda nije bila do kraja podvrgnuta kontroli, odnosno nekoliko je elemenata koji su pridonosili nesigurnosti. Kao prvo, određeni, a izgleda ne tako mali broj plemića još je ustrajao na sukobima. Osim toga, figure poput Emerika Bubeke, makar su vratile Sigismundovu milost i dalje su bile neugodni susjedi. Tako su u lipnju 1404. slavonski banovi uputili nalog Čazmanskom kaptolu da u posjed Ervenicu uvede Pavla literata i Stjepana Lovrina *de Sancto Andrea*, koji im je na ime vjernosti dao kralj, no u čiji posjed zbog straha od priora Emerika nisu mogli ući, a sada kada je on pokojni, to čine.³⁶ Nesigurnost u drugom pogledu otkriva slučaj Katarine, udovice Jurja Batthyányija, i njezinih maloljetnih sinova Alberta, Ladislava i Jurja. Oni su se pred kraljem tužili da su im biskup Eberhard i Ivan Marot (kojeg se tu naziva slavonskim banom, dokaz prije svega da je bio Sigismundov čovjek zadužen za vojne operacije južno od Drave) nepravedno oduzeli slavonski posjed *Zenthjacab* na račun kraljevske darovnice koja ih prikazuje kao nevjerne. Kralj je pak uvažio njihove pritužbe te ih uzeo u svoju zaštitu.³⁷ Dakle, dok su pobunjenici unosili nered i nesigurnost, jednako su to radili i kraljevi pouzdanici, koristeći priliku da bi se beskrupulozno domogli posjeda.

Iz takve dvostruke nesigurnosti proizlazila je potreba daljnjeg djelovanja u Slavoniji, koja je tijekom prosinca poprimila specifičan oblik u vidu aktivnosti petorice velikaša – zagrebačkog biskupa Eberharda, mačvanskog bana Ivana Marota,

this context, what matters the most is that they did not openly side against Sigismund.³⁵

Notwithstanding the differences between Zagreb and Križevci Counties, earlier royal donations (those from late October and early November) perceived Slavonia as a whole at the level of discourse, juxtaposing it against Croatia and Dalmatia (and stating that Sigismund had never established his rule over the latter two). But it seems that Slavonia itself was not completely under his rule and that there were elements which contributed to insecurity in that region. For one thing, a number (rather large, it seems) of noblemen still insisted on continuation of the conflict. Also, figures like Emeric Bebek, although restored to Sigismund's favor, continued to be objectionable neighbors. Thus, in June 1404, the *bans* of Slavonia instructed the Chapter of Čazma to introduce Paul *litteratus* and Stephen *de Sancto Andrea* (son of Lawrence) into the possession of Ervenica estate awarded to them by the king for their loyalty, which had not been done by then for fear of Prior Emeric, but now he was dead.³⁶ There were other manifestations of the abovementioned insecurity, like in the case of Catherine, widow of George Batthyány, and her under-aged sons Albert, Ladislaus and George. They complained to the king that Bishop Eberhard and John of Maroth (the latter being referred to as a Slavonian *ban*, which can be seen primarily as evidence that he was in charge of Sigismund's military campaigns south of the Drava) wrongfully deprived them of the possession of their Slavonian estate *Zenthjacab* because they had been declared rebels in a royal donation. The king upheld their complaint and took them under his protection.³⁷ Clearly, both the rebels and the loyal noblemen created disturbances and insecurity, unscrupulously using the opportunity to get hold of other people's estates.

This double insecurity called for action in Slavonia. In December, it was five barons who took the

³⁵ Ančić 2009: 65–69; za drukčiji pogled koji ne ostavlja mjesta dvojbi o političkoj odanosti Zrinskih Sigismundu v. kod Karbić i Miljan 2012: 100–103; te za Blagajске Kekez 2015 koji pak ne konzultira Ančić 2009; za promjene strana pojedinaca nakon što su 1402. prihvatili Sigismundov dogovor o nasljeđivanju s Albertom Habsburškim v. Bard 1978: 26, bilj. 2.

³⁶ Šišić 1938: 242–243.

³⁷ Šišić 1938: 235.

³⁵ Ančić 2009: 65–69; for a different view that leaves no doubt about the Zrinski's political loyalty to Sigismund, see Karbić & Miljan 2012: 100–103; for Blagaj family, see Kekez 2015, who has not consulted Ančić 2009; for individuals switching sides after accepting Sigismund's 1402 succession agreement with Albert of Habsburg, see Bard 1978: 26, n. 2.

³⁶ Šišić 1938: 242–243.

³⁷ Šišić 1938: 235.

banova Dalmacije, Hrvatske i Slavonije Ladislava od Gordove i Pavla Bissena te Martina Dersa, uz koje se pojavljuje i tavernik Nikola Treutel³⁸ – koji su prema kraljevskom nalogu za kraj godine, 28. prosinca, sazvali shod (*congregatio generalis*) u Križevcima.³⁹ Kakvo objašnjenje za takav potez daju same isprave izdane tijekom tog shoda? U srži stoji potreba jasnijeg razdvajanja vjernih od nevjernih ili, kako se veli, plemstvo okupljeno na shodu trebalo je pomoći *iustos ab iniustis fidelesque ab infidelibus sequestrare et manifeste propallare*, jer je u procesu dijeljenja kraljevskih darovnica dobar dio njih išao nauštrb onih koji su ostali vjerni Sigismundu, na što ukazuje i ranije spomenuti primjer Batthanyija, ili nauštrb onih koji su se pak pridržavali uvjeta za dobivanje milosti.⁴⁰ Sve stoga upućuje na probleme koje je dvor imao nakon ponude kraljevske milosti pobunjenicima iz listopada 1403. u razlučivanju „vjernih i nevjernih“, što je komplicirao niz faktora: velikaši su i slavonsko plemstvo denunciirali svoje protivnike te bili nagrađivani njihovim posjedima, a takve optužbe nije se moglo uzimati zdravo za gotovo; neki su plemići dobivali pomilovanje, ali se pokazalo da su i dalje ustrajali u stvaranju nereda u kraljevstvu, dočim su neki po pomilovanju uistinu odustajali od daljnjeg otpora, ali su im posjedi svejedno bili oduzeti. Sve to stvaralo je ogromnu zbrku i otežavalo raspetljavanje političke krize na mikrorazini, odnosno dvoru je bilo vrlo teško imati pouzdane informacije, a susljedno tome i držati nadzor nad

action: Eberhard (Bishop of Zagreb), John of Maroth (Ban of Mačva), Ladislaus of Gordova and Paul of Bissen (Bans of Dalmatia, Croatia and Slavonia), and Martin Ders, together with *magister tavernicorum* Nicholas Treutel.³⁸ By the king's order, they convened the assembly (*congregatio generalis*) in Križevci for 28 December.³⁹ The reason for this move can be found in the charters issued during the assembly. In essence, there was a need for establishing a clear line between the rebels and loyal noblemen or, as it was stated in the charters, the assembled noblemen were supposed to help “*iustos ab iniustis fidelesque ab infidelibus sequestrare et manifeste propallare*”, because a number of royal donations were made at the expense of those who had remained loyal to Sigismund (as the case of the abovementioned Batthyány family indicates) or those who had fulfilled the requirements for receiving royal grace.⁴⁰ All this indicates the problems that the king's court was facing in telling loyal nobleman from rebels after the royal pardon offered to the rebels in October 1403. These problems were caused by a number of factors: barons and Slavonian nobility were denouncing their opponents and were in return awarded their estates. Such accusations could not be taken for granted. On the one hand, some noblemen were pardoned but it turned out they persisted in creating disorder in the realm; others, on the other hand, really gave up further resistance, but were deprived of their estates nevertheless. All this caused major

³⁸ Šišić 1938: 237.

³⁹ Pet isprava u kojima se spominje shod naveo je Rokai 1983: 566, bilj. 102, a riječ je o registima br. 2905, 2906, 2907, 3660 i 4704 kod ZsO, II/1.

⁴⁰ MNL OL, DF 8937: „fideles qui eorum personas possessiones et cuncta bona fortune casibus submitiendo pro honoris ipsius domini nostri domini Sigismundi regis augmento et sue sacre corone exaltacione gratissima et laudedigna servicia exhibendo studuerunt complacere indefesse, quorum prefatus dominus Sigismundus rex gratuitis famulatibus intuitis ob ipsorum serviciorum recompensationem nonnullas ipsorum suorum infidelium possessiones et porciones possessionarias ex mera sue regie maiestatis auctoritate contulisset possidendam et forte eciam talium nobilium suorum possessiones qui factis in premissis omnino rei et culpabiles non forent ad importunam tamen suorum fidelium supplicationem eisdem donavisset pro quibus sue anime detrimentum deberet evenire“.

³⁸ Šišić 1938: 237.

³⁹ The five documents mentioning the assembly are listed in Rokai 1983: 566, n. 102; these are the regesta no. 2905, 2906, 2907, 3660 and 4704 in ZsO, II/1.

⁴⁰ MNL OL, DF 8937: “fideles qui eorum personas possessiones et cuncta bona fortune casibus submitiendo pro honoris ipsius domini nostri domini Sigismundi regis augmento et sue sacre corone exaltacione gratissima et laudedigna servicia exhibendo studuerunt complacere indefesse, quorum prefatus dominus Sigismundus rex gratuitis famulatibus intuitis ob ipsorum serviciorum recompensationem nonnullas ipsorum suorum infidelium possessiones et porciones possessionarias ex mera sue regie maiestatis auctoritate contulisset possidendam et forte eciam talium nobilium suorum possessiones qui factis in premissis omnino rei et culpabiles non forent ad importunam tamen suorum fidelium supplicationem eisdem donavisset pro quibus sue anime detrimentum deberet evenire”.

lokalnim prilikama u takvim okolnostima. Tako se u gotovo svim darovnicama izdanim tijekom kraja listopada i početka studenoga navodi da recipijenti oduzetih posjeda dvoru trebaju javiti broj selišta koja su dobili, što također ukazuje na prijeku potrebu dvora za raznim vrstama informacija koje je bilo zahtjevno prikupiti. Pritom ne treba smetnuti s uma i iduće: iz pozicije naknadne pameti modernim je povjesničarima jasno da je Sigismund uspješno riješio prijetnju svojoj vlasti, no krajem 1403. to se nije moralo činiti tako izglednim. Slavonija je predstavljala granicu s područjima koja nisu uopće priznavala Sigismundovu vlast, to jest s obzirom na prethodnih 20-ak godina teško da je itko mogao zamisliti da će idućih 30-ak godina Sigismundove vladavine proći bez tako velikih izazova njegovu kraljevskom autoritetu. U tom kontekstu poslanstvo petorice velikaša funkcioniralo je kao demonstracija moći, ali je njihov zadatak bio i uvođenje reda na lokalnoj razini da bi se izbjegla mogućnost tinjanja ponovnog otpora koji bi mogla generirati nesigurnost i nered nastao, između ostalog, mahanjem ispravama izdanim u kraljevo ime. Što se može razaznati o radu shoda?

U relevantnim se dokumentima navodi da je shod privukao velik broj plemića te da su prisežnici bili dužni zaprisegnuti na raspelo, ali i na relikvije, koje se inače ne pojavljuju kao element u takvim ritualnim radnjama na slavonskim općim shodovima u prethodnom razdoblju.⁴¹ Potom je njihov zadatak bio utvrditi tko je zapravo ostao nevjeran Sigismundu, to jest utvrditi tko nije zaslužio da se uz njegovo ime veže *infidelitatis notam, crimen contagium ac maculam*, kako se veli u jednoj ispravi.⁴² Takvo što uključivalo je i rješavanje praktičnih posjedovnih pravnih pitanja, koja su se na primjer ticala posjeda danih u zalog, a koji su sada bili oduzeti.⁴³ Osmi pak dan održavanja shoda bio je posljednji, te su tog 4. siječnja petorica velikaša izdavala povelje dvostrukog sadržaja. Jedne su garantirale nečiju vjernost, to jest sklanjale su s njegova imena mogućnost prišivanja etikete pobunjenika, a takve su bile na primjer isprave izdan u korist Tome Martinova *de Mendzenh* iz Križevačke županije te Ivana Andrijinog *de*

confusion and made the resolution of the political crisis at the micro level more difficult because the Court had large problems obtaining reliable information and thus maintaining control over local state of affairs. For example, in almost every donation issued in late October and early November it is specified that all the recipients of the confiscated estates should inform the court about the number of tenant plots they had received. This also indicates that various types of information were much needed by the court because they were hard to obtain. One should also keep in mind that, while it is clear to modern historians that Sigismund was successful in dealing with the threats to his power, the prospects for it may not have seemed so certain in late 1403, especially because Slavonia bordered on the regions that did not recognize Sigismund's rule. Given the past 20 years, the contemporaries must have had hard time believing that the following 30 years of his reign would be free of such major challenges to his royal authority. In this context, the deputation of five barons was a demonstration of power. However, their mission was also to bring order at the local level in order to avoid renewed sparks of resistance resulting from the insecurity and disorder created, among other things, by wielding royal charters. What is known about the assembly itself?

According to relevant sources, a large number of noblemen attended it. Sworn assessors were obliged to swear not only on the crucifix but also on the holy relics. Indicatively, the latter had usually been absent from such rituals at earlier general assemblies in Slavonia.⁴¹ Their task was also to establish who had actually remained disloyal to Sigismund and who did not deserve to have the stain of unfaithfulness attached to their name ("*infidelitatis notam, crimen contagium ac maculam*", as specified in one source).⁴² This also included solving legal possessory issues – for example, the cases of confiscation of pledged estates.⁴³ On the eighth – final – day of the assembly (4 January), the five noblemen were issuing two kinds of charters. One guaranteed a person's loyalty and thus eliminated the possibility

⁴¹ MNL OL, DL 24705.

⁴² MNL OL, DF 282216.

⁴³ Šišić 1938: 237–238.

⁴¹ MNL OL, DL 24705.

⁴² MNL OL, DF 282216.

⁴³ Šišić 1938: 237–238.

Horzowa i njegovih sinova.⁴⁴ Druge su pak potvrdivale nečiju nevjeru te su im oduzimani posjedi. Ivan Marot dobio je posjede Pekrija koje mu je kralj već darovao početkom studenoga,⁴⁵ Martin Ders i njegov brat Sigismund dobili su posjede Ladislava Stjepanova, Stjepana i Ivana, Ivanovih sinova, te Petra Herceka i Sigismunda, sinova Ladislava od Also-lindva,⁴⁶ a Ladislav i Adam Kastellanfy dobili su posjede Ivana Tiboldova de *Zenche*.⁴⁷

Kako bi pak u potpunosti *iustos ab iniustis fidelesque ab infidelibus sequestrare et manifeste propallare*, osim što je izabran shod kao najjavniiji oblik političke komunikacije tog društva, čime se na pojavnoj razini, u smislu fizičke prisutnosti, radila razlika „vjernih“ i „nevjernih“, razdjelnica je uspostavljena i u trajnijem obliku, u formi pisane riječi. Naime, na shodu je sastavljen i registar (*registrum*), koji nije ostao sačuvan, već se u izvorima pojavljuje tek nekoliko puta, u koji su unesena imena „nevjernih“, koje su imenovali prisežnici određeni na tome shodu.⁴⁸ Shod i unos imena u poseban dokument (*registrum*) dio su rutinskog repertoara kojim se tijekom 14. stoljeća održavao red, odnosno borilo protiv notornih zločinaca (*malefactores*) koji su narušavali red u lokalnim

of labeling him a traitor (like the charters issued to Thomas of *Mendzenth*, son of Martin, from Križevci County, and John son of Andrew of *Horzowa* and his sons).⁴⁴ The other confirmed someone's disloyalty and registered confiscation of their estates [for example, John of Maroth received the Pekri estates awarded to him by the king back in early November;⁴⁵ Martin Ders and his brother Sigismund were awarded the estates of Ladislaus (son of Stephen), Stephen and John (sons of John), and Peter Hercek and Sigismund (sons of Ladislaus) of Also-lindva;⁴⁶ Ladislaus and Adam Kastellanfy were awarded the estates of John of *Zenche*, son of Tibold⁴⁷].

In order to fully “*iustos ab iniustis fidelesque ab infidelibus sequestrare et manifeste propallare*”, assembly was chosen as the most public form of communication in the society of that time, thus using noblemen's physical presence to make difference between the “loyal noblemen” and the “rebels”. A more permanent difference was made in writing: a register (*registrum*) containing the names of the “rebels” was made by the sworn assessors appointed at the assembly.⁴⁸ The register has not been preserved; we only know about it because it is mentioned in sources several times. Such assemblies and registers

⁴⁴ MNL OL, DF 282216, 230845.

⁴⁵ ZsO, II/1, dok. 2905, MNL OL, DL 8937.

⁴⁶ ZsO, II/1, dok. 2906. Prilikom izdavanja darovnica navedeni su velikaši pazili da se, u slučaju da su oni recepijenti, njihovo ime ne nađe među onima koji podjeljuju darovnicu.

⁴⁷ ZsO, II/1, dok. 2907, MNL OL, DL 42830. Ivan Tiboldov je pak 28. listopada dobio kraljevske isprave o posebnoj milosti, I. Mažuran 2002: 259.

⁴⁸ MNL OL, DL 33081: „qui in registro in generali congregatione ex speciali mandato et commissione eiusdem domini nostri regis in regno Sclavonie (...) pro inquierendis et notandis fidelibus et infidelibus regni sui Sclavonie pridem celebrata inter infideles suos in eidem registro conscriptas non inuenerentur“; Lukinović 1992: 286–288: „hii, qui in congregatione generali (...) ex commissione eiusdem regie maiestatis, hic Crisii celebrata, extradari, ac in registro infidelium quinque sigillis eorundem prelatorum et baronum consignato“; MNL OL, DL 32763: „viso et diligenter examinato pretacto registro in quo scilicet tempore sepefate congregationis generalis nomina nostrorum infidelium conscripta sunt et intititata“; „per iuratos assessores dicte congregacionis generalis pro nostris et sacre notoriis infidelibus adherentibusque ipsius Ladislai filii condam Karoli et suorum sequacium extradati, numerati et reputati“, Mažuran 2002: 326.

⁴⁴ MNL OL, DF 282216, 230845.

⁴⁵ ZsO, II/1, doc. 2905, MNL OL, DL 8937.

⁴⁶ ZsO, II/1, doc. 2906. When issuing the donations, the abovementioned noblemen made sure that, if they were the recipients, their respective names would not be included among those awarding the donation.

⁴⁷ ZsO, II/1, doc. 2907, MNL OL, DL 42830. John, son of Tibold, received a royal document on special royal grace on 28 October, I. Mažuran 2002: 259.

⁴⁸ MNL OL, DL 33081: “qui in registro in generali congregatione ex speciali mandato et commissione eiusdem domini nostri regis in regno Sclavonie (...) pro inquierendis et notandis fidelibus et infidelibus regni sui Sclavonie pridem celebrata inter infideles suos in eidem registro conscriptas non inuenerentur”; Lukinović 1992: 286–288: “hii, qui in congregatione generali (...) ex commissione eiusdem regie maiestatis, hic Crisii celebrata, extradari, ac in registro infidelium quinque sigillis eorundem prelatorum et baronum consignato”; MNL OL, DL 32763: “viso et diligenter examinato pretacto registro in quo scilicet tempore sepefate congregationis generalis nomina nostrorum infidelium conscripta sunt et intititata”; “per iuratos assessores dicte congregacionis generalis pro nostris et sacre notoriis infidelibus adherentibusque ipsius Ladislai filii condam Karoli et suorum sequacium extradati, numerati et reputati”, Mažuran 2002: 326.

društvima.⁴⁹ Oslonac na takav mehanizam rješavanja krize stoga je indikativan kada se želi pojmiti kako je dvor gledao na situaciju u Slavoniji na kraju 1403. No istovremeno ipak ne treba smetnuti s uma da je stvar bila daleko od rutinske; bila je odgovor na posljedice ozbiljne političke krize – održavanje shoda pod predsjedanjem petorice velikaša poslanih s dvora te prisutnost relikvija znak su da su ustaljeni mehanizmi, korišteni u izdavanju i kažnjavanju onih koji su ozbiljno narušavali društveni red i mir, upotrijebljeni u izvanrednim okolnostima.

Postupci kraljevske delegacije s kraja 1403., uključujući i izradu registra, imali su dakle dvojak cilj. S jedne strane, trebali su unijeti strah, svijest o odgovornosti vlasti koja je djelotvorna te time ugasiti svaki oblik mogućeg otpora kraljevskom autoritetu u pokrajini koja je predstavljala granicu spram dijelova kraljevstva koji su ostali izvan dosega Sigismundova autoriteta, u čemu se i uspjelo. Ti su ciljevi najvećim dijelom i ostvareni jer u Slavoniji nakon toga nema nikakvih naznaka djelovanja protiv Sigismundove vlasti. S druge pak strane, trebalo je uvesti reda u procese nagrađivanja/kažnjavanja, to jest pružiti dvoru pouzdane informacije o političkoj odanosti slavonskog plemstva. Time su se mogle ukloniti zlouporabe i pogrešne odluke koje su očigledno stvarale nezadovoljstvo kod onih koji su smatrali da su oštećeni, čime se moglo stvoriti plodno tlo za ponovno rasplamsavanje otpora. U tom se pogledu registar nevjernih čini kao iznimno važan dokument za razumijevanje administrativnog uređenja i funkcioniranja kraljevstva i dvora, odnosno za osjetljivo pitanje razdvajanja i postupanja prema vjernima/nevjernima i nakon shoda s kraja 1403., bez čega je nemoguće razumijevanje lokalnih, slavonskih prilika u prvom desetljeću 15. stoljeća.

Svi spomeni registra, ukupno u tri prilike, datiraju iz svibnja i lipnja 1406. godine. Prvi se put spominje u ispravi Hermana Celjskog od 6.

of names were part of a regular repertoire used in the 14th century to maintain order and fight notorious criminals (*malefactores*) who were disturbing peace in local societies.⁴⁹ Relying on such crisis-solving mechanism is indicative for the court's view of the situation in Slavonia in late 1403. One should nevertheless keep in mind that the situation was far from routine; rather, it was a reaction to the aftermath of a serious political crisis. Convening an assembly presided by five barons sent by the court and the presence of holy relics suggest that the regular mechanisms – normally used for separating and punishing those responsible for serious public disturbance – were now used under extraordinary circumstances.

The actions of the royal deputation in late 1403, including the making of the register, had two goals. On the one hand, they were supposed to instill fear and the perception of a responsible and efficient government, thus suppressing any resistance to Sigismund's authority in a region bordering with the parts of the kingdom that had remained outside his power. They were mostly successful in it – there would be no indications of actions against Sigismund's authority in the subsequent period. On the other hand, the rewarding/punishing processes had to be put in order and thus provide the court with reliable information about the political loyalty of the Slavonian nobility. This could eliminate the abuses and wrong decisions that had clearly created discontent among those who considered themselves wronged and that could furnish fertile ground for rekindling the resistance. In this respect, the Register of Rebels seems very important for understanding the administrative practice and functioning of both the kingdom and the court, as well as for the delicate issue of separating the loyal noblemen from the rebels even after the assembly in late 1403 which is crucial for understanding the local conditions in Slavonia in the first decade of the 15th century.

⁴⁹ Rady 2000: 166–167; za primjer registra nastalog na shodu u slučaju županija Szabolcs i Bereg v. Tóth, 2019; v. i korisnu paralelu za kraljevske gradove kod Szende 2018: 151–152, 170; općenito za slavonske shodove tijekom 14. st., v. Halász 2017.

⁴⁹ Rady 2000: 166–167; for the example of the assembly register in Szabolcs and Bereg Counties, see Tóth, 2019; for a useful analogy for royal boroughs, see Szende 2018: 151–152, 170; for Slavonian assemblies in the 14th century in general, see Halász 2017.

svibnja u kojoj se navodi da su mu Gašpar i Petar Andrijini *de Precezha* pokazali kraljevske isprave. U njima je stajalo da je kralj s prelatima i barunima odlučio da se svima onima čije se ime ne može pronaći u registru nevjernih trebaju vratiti njihovi posjedi, pa je tako kralj dvojici banova dao u nalog da uvedu navedene plemiće u njihov posjed koji im kralj vraća jer njihovo ime nije pronašao u navedenom registru. Teško je поближе vremenski odrediti nastanak takve kraljevske odluke, odnosno kada je nastao i odaslan navedeni nalog banovima, no širi kontekst u kojem ona nastaje pokazuje da problem nije bio samo lokalni, slavonski, već na razini cijelog kraljevstva. Naime, u prosincu 1404. izdan je kraljevski dekret koji je bio odgovor na pritužbe nemalog broja plemića čiji su posjedi bili oduzeti i podijeljeni Sigismundovim privrženicima. Dio njih tvrdio je da je dobio posebnu milost kralja, dio je tvrdio da nije radio protiv kralja sukladno ponudi kraljevske milosti iz listopada 1403., dok se neki nisu ni na kakav način ogriješili o kralja, a svejedno su im posjedi oduzeti i darovani trećima.⁵⁰ Navedene pritužbe zapravo ukazuju na poteškoće u rješavanju upravo onih problema koji su se pojavili već nakon studenoga 1403. i koji su, barem dijelom, stajali iza odluke za djelovanje u Slavoniji kroz formu shoda i izrade registra. Problemi su to uostalom koji se jasno pokazuju i u Slavoniji, u cjelokupnom rasponu slučajeva navedenom u Sigismundovu dekretu, i iza siječnja 1404. Herman Grebenski, koji je pristajao uz ostrogonskoga nadbiskupa Ivana Kaniškog, u travnju 1404. dobio je kraljevu posebnu milost, no kralj je u travnju 1405. morao dati u nalog slavonskim banovima da ga zaštite jer su njegovi rođaci Nikola i Ivan Petrovi Grebenski na ime kraljevske darovnice zauzeli i držali njegove posjede.⁵¹ Sličan je i primjer Grgura Mihovilova *de Gyepew* koji je 25. kolovoza 1404. dobio posebnu kraljevu milost, no čije posjede je, između ostalih, zahtijevao zagrebački biskup Eberhard u veljači 1405. pred kraljem. Eberhard se tužio da mu banovi nisu omogućili uživanje posjeda većeg broja slavonskih plemića koji su bili

All mentions of the register – three of them altogether – date from May and June 1406. It is first mentioned in the charter of Herman of Celje of 6 May, stating that Casper and Peter of *Precezha*, sons of Andrew, presented royal charters to him. The charters specified that the king, prelates and barons had decided that estates should be returned to all those whose names were not in the Register of Rebels and that, since their names were not found in the register, these noblemen should be introduced into the possession of their estate. This king's decision and his order to the *bans* to carry it out are hard to date accurately, but the context in which the decision was made indicates that the problem did not concern only Slavonia – it concerned the entire kingdom. As a reaction to the complaints of a large number of noblemen whose estates had been confiscated and awarded to Sigismund's supporters, a royal decree was issued in December 1404. Some of them claimed they had received royal grace, others claimed they had not worked against the king in accordance with the royal grace offered in 1403, while yet others claimed they had done nothing against the king but their estates had been confiscated nevertheless and awarded to third parties.⁵⁰ These complaints reflect the difficulties in solving the problems that arose immediately after November 1403 and that, at least partly, were the reason for convening the assembly and making the register in Slavonia. After all, the entire wide range of cases mentioned in Sigismund's decree were clearly present in Slavonia even after January 1404. Herman of Greben, who had sided with John of Kanizsa, the Bishop of Esztergom, received special royal grace in April 1404. Still, in April 1405 the king was forced to order the Slavonian *bans* to protect Herman, because his relatives Nicholas and John of Greben (sons of Peter) had taken and kept his estates on the basis of the royal donation.⁵¹ Similar was the case of Gregory of *Gyepew* (son of Michael). Although he had received special royal grace on 25 August 1404, Eberhard, Bishop of Zagreb, demanded his estates from the king in February 1405. Eberhard complained that the *bans* refused to let him enjoy the estates of a number of Slavonian noblemen

⁵⁰ DRMH, II, 31–32.

⁵¹ Šišić 1938: 239–240, 246–247.

⁵⁰ DRMH, II, 31–32.

⁵¹ Šišić 1938: 239–240, 246–247.

određeni kao nevjerni na shodu 1403., između ostalih i Grgurovih, a koje mu je kralj darovao.⁵² Nadalje, na isti dan kad i Grgur Gyepew i Nikola Latkov dobio je kraljevsku milost jer nakon roka nije radio nikakvih zlodjela, ali su svejedno njegovi posjedi darovani Nikoli *de Newna*.⁵³ Posljednju kategoriju iz Sigismundova dekreta predstavljaju slučajevi nalik onome ranije spomenutih Gašpara i Petra *de Precezha*, koji nisu ništa zgriješili. Sve to ukazuje na nesigurnost u posjedovnim pravima koja je u dobroj mjeri bila izazvana kontradiktornim i suprotstavljenim kraljevskim darivanjima posjeda i dijeljenjima milosti. Da je stanje u Slavoniji odgovaralo tonu iz kraljevskog prosinačkog dekreta, ukazuje nadalje kraljeva najava iz studenoga 1405. o planiranom održavanju općeg shoda pod kraljevim predsjedanjem u Slavoniji, no do kojeg očigledno nije došlo.⁵⁴ U konačnici, upravo oblik u kojem su kralj i njegovi baruni kao opće pravilo odredili da se posjedi vrate svima onima čije ime nije na registru nevjernika, otkriva da takvih slučajeva nije bilo malo, odnosno nazire se da su upravo takvi problemi značajno opterećivali lokalne prilike te su utjecali na odluke dvora o načinu upravljanja Slavonijom. To otkrivaju i aktivnosti Hermana Celjskog u Slavoniji.

Naime, 7. lipnja u Križevcima, dok je sjedio na sudu sa slavonskim plemstvom, pred njih je došao nemali broj plemića koji su upućivali pritužbe da su im posjedi i posjedovna prava u nedavnim nemirima zauzeta i oduzeta. Na to je Herman, imajući pred očima Boga i njegovu pravdu te brinući se za kraljevu dušu, kako se veli u ispravi, odlučio da oni čija se imena nisu našla u registru nevjernih, trebaju dobiti natrag svoje posjede i treba ih se zaštititi u njihovim pravima, što je zapravo potpuno eksplicitno preuzimanje agende izrečene u kraljevskom mandatu vezanom za slučaj *Prezechne*. Na to je pak sam registar bio donesen te javno pročitano, što se vidi iz slučaja Nikole i pokojnog Petra, sinova Ivana

(including Gregory's) donated to him by the king after the noblemen had been identified as rebels at the assembly of 1403.⁵² Nicholas son of Latko received royal grace on the same day as Gregory Gyepew, based on the fact that he had committed no crimes after the deadline. Still, his estates were awarded to Nicholas of *Newna*.⁵³ The final category of the cases in Sigismund's decree is the one comprising cases like the one of the abovementioned Casper and Peter of *Precezha*, who had committed no crimes whatsoever. All this indicates insecurity in proprietary rights, caused largely by the king's contradictory donations and royal pardons. King's November 1405 announcement of a general assembly in Slavonia with him presiding (which obviously never took place) indicates that the situation in Slavonia was pretty much as described in the king's December decree.⁵⁴ After all, the fact that the king and his barons ordered estates to be returned to those whose names were not in the Register of Rebels indicates that such cases were many and that such problems substantially affected the local state of affairs and court's administration of Slavonia. The activities of Herman of Celje in Slavonia also reveal this.

In Križevci, on 7 June, while he was passing verdicts together with Slavonian nobility, a number of noblemen appeared before them complaining that they had been deprived of their estates and their proprietary rights during recent unrest. According to a charter, Herman decided, with God and His justice on his mind and concerned for the king's soul, that those whose names had not been entered into the Register of Rebels should be given back their estates and that their rights should be protected. It was explicitly the same agenda as the one espoused in the royal mandate in connection with the *Prezechne* case. The register was read in public, as can be seen from the case of Nicholas and late Peter of *Buthkafelde* (sons of John). Their names had not been entered into the register, which meant

⁵² Mažuran 2002: 312; MNL OL, DL 9011.

⁵³ Šišić 1938: 295–296.

⁵⁴ Laszowski 1904: 258. Kralj je dobar dio 1405. proveo južno od Drave, zaokupljen bosanskim poslovima, pa je sa same lokalne razine mogao dočuti nezadovoljstvo; za itinerar v. Engel & Tóth 2005: 83–84.

⁵² Mažuran 2002: 312; MNL OL, DL 9011.

⁵³ Šišić 2002: 295–296.

⁵⁴ Laszowski 1904: 258. Occupied with his Bosnian affairs, King spent most of 1405 south of the Drava and thus had an opportunity to learn directly about the local discontent; for his itinerary, see Engel & Tóth 2005: 83–84.

de Buthkafelde, čija imena nisu bila zapisana u registar, što je značilo da je njihove posjede nepravedno zauzeo zbog nevjere Nikola Martinov, familijar prethodnog bana, Pavla Bissena, te su uvedeni u njih.⁵⁵ I idući slučaj odigrao se istog dana pred banom i slavonskim plemstvom u Križevcima, kada su siročad (*orphani*) Ladislav *pauper studens* i Nikola, sinovi Petra *de Iwelouch*, pokazali Sigismundovu ispravu od 2. lipnja. U njoj je stajalo da su pokojni Dominik Petrov *de Beryn* i njegova braća dobili njihov posjed tvrdeći da su bili nevjerni, što su oni zanijekali. Nakon toga pregledan je registar i utvrđeno je da se njihova imena ne nalaze u njemu, pa je kralj dao nalog da im se vrati nepravedno oduzet posjed. Ban ističe da je uzeo navedeni registar te je dao da ga se javno pročita pa je, s obzirom na to da u njemu nisu pronađena imena ni navedene siročadi ni njihova oca, dao nalog da ih se, što je i učinjeno, uvede u posjed.⁵⁶ Sva tri slučaja u kojima se spominje registar nevjernih, dakle, otkrivaju isto – plemiće čije se ime nije našlo na registru, to jest nisu bili nevjerni, ali čiji su posjedi ipak bili prisvojeni, očigledno svaki put na temelju kraljeve darovnice. Da je takvih slučajeva bilo više, svjedoči izraz o nemalom broju plemića koji su se našli pred banom.⁵⁷ Pritom treba dodati dvije stvari. Kao prvo, nakon što su s banske časti skinuta dva Pavla, postojala je određena rezerva na dvoru što učiniti s tim položajem, jer se Herman u svojim ispravama izdanim tijekom svibnja navodi kao *tocius regni Sclavonie conservator* i *gubernator* – titula bana Slavonije, Dalmacije i Hrvatske

that their estates were unjustly confiscated from them on account of their disloyalty and awarded to Nicholas (son of Martin), retainer of previous ban Paul of Bissen. They were subsequently introduced into the possession of these estates.⁵⁵ The following case was also presented to the Ban and Slavonian nobility in Križevci. The orphans (*orphani*) Ladislaus *pauper studens* and Nicholas of *Iwelouch* (sons of Peter) submitted King Sigismund's charter of 2 June which stated that late Dominic of *Beryn* (son of Peter) and his brothers claimed that the orphans were rebels and thus acquired the estate of the latter. The orphans claimed otherwise. The register was then consulted and, upon establishing that their names were not in it, the king ordered that their unjustly confiscated estate be returned to them. The *ban* stated that, upon receiving such an order, he had had the register read in public and, as the names of the said orphans and their father were not in it, he had ordered that they be reintroduced into the possession of their estate, and it was done so.⁵⁶ Consequently, all three cases in which the register is mentioned reveal the same thing – that there were noblemen whose name was not in the register (in other words, who were not rebels) but whose estates were nevertheless confiscated by means of royal donation. The *ban's* charter emphasizes that quite a number of noblemen appeared before him seeking justice, which implies that there were more cases similar to the three just discussed.⁵⁷ Two

⁵⁵ Lukinović 1992: 286–288.

⁵⁶ MNL OL, DL 32763.

⁵⁷ U Hermanovoj ispravi od 15. svibnja 1406. navodi se da su neke plemkinje *de Prasnicha* došle pred Hermana i plemstvo okupljeno u Križevcima te pokazale Sigismundove isprave u kojima stoji da je Katica *de Prasnicha* 10. lipnja, najvjerojatnije 1405., pred kraljevskim vijećem ustala i optužila Ivana *de Kozouch* i Ivana *de Zobochyna* da su ih u kolovozu 1404. izbacili iz njihovih posjeda tvrdeći da su ih dobili od kralja na ime nevjere. Kralj je sa svojim vijećem uvažio njihovu optužbu jer su vidjeli da rečene plemkinje „nil infidelitatis nilque noxii et criminis contra suam maiestatem incurrisse, fecisse, commisisse et perpetrasse sane agnovisset et clare intellexisset“. Skriva li se iza tog izraza korištenje registra, teško je sasvim odrečno ustvrditi, no iznimna sličnost s prethodna tri slučaja na to ukazuje. Uglavnom, kralj je nakon odluke odaslao nalog dvama banovima da rečene plemkinje uvedu u posjed, što su oni i učinili, da bi to ponovili i Hermanovi ljudi (Šišić 1938: 271–272).

⁵⁵ Lukinović 1992: 286–288.

⁵⁶ MNL OL, DL 32763.

⁵⁷ According to Herman's charter of 15 May 1406, some noblewomen of Prasnich came before Herman and the nobility assembled in Križevci. There they submitted Sigmund's charters stating that, on 10 June (probably 1405), Catherine of Prasnicha accused John of Kozouch and John of Zobochyn before the royal council that they had ousted them from their estates in August 1404, claiming they had been awarded those estates on account of the women's disloyalty to the king. King and his council resolved their case favorably upon realizing that the said noblewomen "nil infidelitatis nilque noxii et criminis contra suam maiestatem incurrisse, fecisse, commisisse et perpetrasse sane agnovisset et clare intellexisset". It is hard to say positively if the above expression indicates the use of the register, but the exceptional similarity with the other three cases so indicates. Be it as it may, having decided in their favor, King ordered the two bans to introduce the said noblewomen into their estate. The bans did that and so did Herman's men (Šišić 1938: 271–272).

zabilježena je prvi put 5. lipnja.⁵⁸ Kao drugo, kako se može vidjeti iz slučaja siročadi, registar se nalazio na dvoru, da bi potom bio donijet u Slavoniju, najkasnije 7. lipnja kada je javno čitan.⁵⁹ S obzirom na to dvoje ne čini se kao slučajnost da se praktično u isti trenutak može smjestiti odluka o stalnom rješenju na banskoj časti te slanje registra u Slavoniju uz pomoć kojeg se trebalo riješiti problem koji je očito snažno remetio lokalne prilike.

Nisu li ti problemi bili možda i uzrokom promjene na banskoj časti? T. Palosfalvi ističe da smijenjeni banovi nisu bili nepodobni, s čime se apsolutno moguće složiti, no drži da je reorganizacija uslijedila zbog kraljeve ženidbe, pa je banom imenovan Herman Celjski.⁶⁰ No, otvoreno je pitanje je li smjena, s kojom je napušten koncept dvojice osoba na banskoj časti, u praksi od 1402., došla kao posljedica ženidbe, ili je ženidba tek utjecala na odabir osobe, dok su uzroci smjene ležali drugdje. Moguće je, naime, da su dotadašnji banovi, Pavao od Peći i Pavao Bissen, postali previše umiješani u lokalne prilike te su se njihovi interesi mogli naći u koliziji s pokušajem dvora da se razriješe problemi koji su izazivali nezadovoljstvo lokalnog plemstva. Iz gornjeg je primjera vidljivo kako je familjar Pavla Bissena nepravedno zauzeo posjed plemića koji se nisu pridružili pobuni protiv Sigismunda. *Populi et hospites* iz Miholca su se 1409. tužili pred zagrebačkim biskupom Andrijom na štete koje su im nanijeli dva bana.⁶¹ Mada im je vratio zauzete posjede, na Pavla od Peći upravo pred njim samim su se tužili i plemići iz Komarnice.⁶² Na koji se način reproducirala nesigurnost djelovanjem banova naslućuje se i iz primjere prije spomenutog Grgura od Gyepewa. Naime, na isti dan, 25.

things should be added here. First, when two Pauls were removed from the position of *ban*, the court was in a dilemma of what to do with the position, because Herman's charters issued in May refer to him as *tocius regni Sclavonie conservator* and *gubernator* (the title of Ban of Slavonia, Dalmatia and Croatia is first mentioned on 5 June).⁵⁸ Second, as can be seen from the orphans' case, the register was kept at the court and was brought to Slavonia for public reading not later than on 7 June.⁵⁹ In the light of this, the fact that the decision on a permanent solution for the person holding the office of ban and the sending of the register to Slavonia where it was supposed to solve a major local disturbance took place virtually at the same time does not seem like a coincidence.

Could it be that the holder(s) of the office of *ban* were replaced because of these problems? One can absolutely agree with T. Pálosfalvi's argument that the replaced bans were not considered politically unsuitable. But he also argues that the reshuffling took place because of the king's wedding and that this is why Herman of Celje was appointed *ban*.⁶⁰ It is, however, debatable whether the replacement of the *bans*, which also marked an end of the concept of dual *bans* that had been in place since 1402, was a consequence of the wedding or did the wedding merely influence the selection of a specific person while the causes of the replacement lay elsewhere. It could be that the previous *bans*, Paul of Peć and Paul of Bissen, had become too involved in the local affairs and that their interests had collided with the court's efforts to deal with the problems that had caused discontent among the local nobility. The above example shows that Paul of Bissen's retainer unjustly got hold of the estate belonging to the noblemen who had not rebelled against Sigismund. In 1409, *populi et hospites*

⁵⁸ MNL OL, DL 103410; 101962, za prvi spomen kao bana MNL OL, DF 34053, iako valja dodati da je Herman naveden kao ban Dalmacije, Hrvatske i Slavonije u kraljevskom dignitariju od 11. travnja (Varjú 1908: 504), no kao relevantne uzimam isprave koje je izdao sam Herman jer preciznije odražavaju kako je on vidio svoju poziciju.

⁵⁹ Relevantna kraljevska isprava (MNL OL, DL 32763) datirana je s 2. lipnja, ali pitanje jest je li zapisana na dan kada se spor našao pred kraljem ili kasnije.

⁶⁰ Pálosfalvi 2004: 46.

⁶¹ Lukinović 1992: 324.

⁶² MNL OL, DF 218641.

⁵⁸ MNL OL, DL 103410; 101962, for first mention of Herman as ban MNL OL, DF 34053. Although Herman is referred to as Ban of Dalmatia, Croatia and Slavonia in the *series dignitatum* (list of dignitaries) in an 11 April charter (Varjú 1908: 504), I only consider relevant the charters issued by Herman himself, because they are more precise in reflecting his own perception of his position.

⁵⁹ The relevant royal charter (MNL OL, DL 32763) is dated 2 June, but it is debatable whether it was written on the very day when the case was submitted to the king or subsequently.

⁶⁰ Pálosfalvi 2004: 46.

kolovoza u Trnavi, kada je on dobio kraljevsku milost, milost su dobili i Nikola Vlatkov i Pavao Dominikov *de Desniche*, rodbinski povezani s banom Pavlom od Peći, iz čega se da zaključiti kako je i Grgur dobio milost na ime intervencije bana Pavla.⁶³ Takva veza onda objašnjava zašto se Eberhard, kao i Mikčec Ivanov od Cirkvene, tužio pred kraljem na probleme koje je imao s banovima i kontrolom nad posjedima koji su im bili darovani, pa tako i nad onim Grgura od Gyepewa.⁶⁴ Takvi slučajevi ukazuju, makar daleko od toga da su pali u nemilost, kako su Hermanovi prethodnici ipak izgradili mrežu lokalnih odnosa koja je otežavala uvođenje reda u Slavoniji, što je onda, čini mi se, moglo utjecati na odluku kralja da ih se smjeni s te časti, pri čemu je pritisak onih koji su ostali bez posjeda makar nisu bili nevjerni izgleda bio naročito velik. No, čak ukoliko takvo tumačenje smjene na banskoj časti nije točno, ipak ostaje činjenica da su problemi razdvajanja vjernih i nevjernih, sa svim posljedicama koje je to za pojedince imalo, bili problem, kako u Slavoniji tako i u Ugarskoj. U tom kontekstu je važno podcrtati da je registar, zapravo ispunjavajući ono što u prvom redu očekuje birokraciji navikli moderni povjesničar, ali što su očekivali i ondašnji akteri, predstavljao izrazito učinkovito administrativno sredstvo, kako se vidi na primjeru rješavanja konkretnih sporova. No, postojanje učinkovitog administrativnog sredstva, kao i novi ban čija je agenda djelomično bila usmjerena k rješavanju takvih problema, nisu bili garant kako će isti biti u potpunosti riješeni. Za to je potrebno fokus prebaciti na još jedan događaj – održavanje shoda u Križevcima 1408.

KRIŽEVAČKI SHOD IZ 1408.

Pod kraljevskim je predsjedanjem u veljači, s početkom 13. veljače, održan shod za Križevačku i Virovitičku županiju. Makar nisu jedini predmeti koji su rješavani na shodu, slučajevi koji su na ovaj ili onaj način repove vukli od 1403. dominiraju među sačuvanom građom o sporovima vođenima

from Miholc complained to Andrew, Bishop of Zagreb, about the damage inflicted upon them by the two *bans*.⁶¹ Although Paul of Peć had returned their estates, the noblemen from Komarnica complained of the ban himself precisely at the banal court.⁶² The earlier mentioned example of Gregory of Gyepew suggests how the *bans'* activities perpetuated insecurity. In Trnava, on the same day when he was pardoned (25 August), Nicholas (son of Vlatko) and Paul de *Desniche* (son of Dominic), related to Ban Paul of Peć, also received royal pardon. This suggests that Gregory, too, was pardoned at the intervention of Ban Paul.⁶³ This connection would explain why Eberhard and Mikčec of Cirkvena (son of John) complained to the king about the problems he had had with the *bans* and with control over the estates awarded to them, including the one of Gregory of Gyepew.⁶⁴ Such cases indicate that, while far from incurring disfavor, Herman's predecessors had nevertheless created a network of local relationships that made it hard to bring order to Slavonia. It seems to me that this could have influenced the king's decision to replace them as *bans*, particularly if the pressure of those who had been dispossessed despite of their loyalty was rather strong. But even if such interpretation of the *bans'* replacement were incorrect, the fact remains that making difference between rebels and loyal noblemen, with all the consequences for individuals, was a problem both in Slavonia and in Hungary. In this context, it is important to point out that the register, while actually meeting the expectations of both modern historians (used to bureaucracy) and the protagonists of that period, was a very efficient administrative instrument, as can be seen from the way how specific disputes were resolved. But the availability of an efficient administrative instrument and the appointment of a new *ban* whose agenda included dealing with such problems were no guarantee that these problems would actually be solved. For this, the focus should be shifted to another event – the Križevci assembly of 1408.

⁶¹ Lukinović 1992: 324.

⁶² MNL OL, DF 218641.

⁶³ For family links, see Nekić 2017: 194.

⁶⁴ See n. 52 and 53 here.

⁶³ Za rodbinske veze v. Nekić 2017: 194.

⁶⁴ V. ovdje bilješke 52 i 53.

na shodu.⁶⁵ Dio njih ne dotiče se pitanja je li netko bio ili nije nevjeran, već se to uzima kao gotovo, ali se pokušava pronaći *modus vivendi* među stranama koje su izgubile posjede i onima kojima su ti isti posjedi darovani.⁶⁶ Nekoliko je pak slučajeva koji su od posebnog interesa za ovu raspravu, gdje srž predstavlja pitanje razdvajanja vjernih od nevjernih.⁶⁷ Sporovi Nikole Vlatkova u sporu s Nikolom de Newna te Pavla Dominikova od Desnice u sporu s rođacima od Desnice, Blažem, Andrijom, Galom i Pavlom, slijede identičan obrazac. Nikola i Pavao ustali su na shodu tvrdeći da su se pridržavali ponude milosti iz listopada te su u prilog tome priložili isprave o milosti, dok je druga strana u sporu priložila isprave o kraljevskom darovanju te kaptola o uvođenju u posjede. Suprotstavljene tvrdnje, srž kojih se ticalo ponašanja nakon ponude milosti, rješavana je pristankom strana u sporu da o tome odluče prisežnici, koji su u oba slučaja svjedočili kako su oštećeni bili nepravедно osuđeni pa su im posjedi vraćeni.⁶⁸ Pored takvih slučajeva u kojima su strane svoje tvrdnje pokušavala potvrditi pismenim svjedočanstvima, postoje i one u kojima su određene strane tek utvrdile kako su im posjedi nepravедно oduzeti bez pisane potkrjepe. Tako su Ivan Filipov i Jakov Ivanov *de Butkhafelde* optužili Nikolu Martinovog *de Syrimio*, familijara Pavla Bissena, da je od kralja tražio njihove posjede na ime nevjere, koje je i dobio kako se vidjelo po kraljevskim poveljama koje je Stjepan Bissen pokazao na shodu. No, plemići od *Butkhafelde* na to su odvratili da se Ivan odvojio od svog oca – čije se sudjelovanje u pobuni nije dovodilo u pitanje – te da je služio Martina Dersa, dok je Jakov tvrdio da nije bio nevjeran ni tijekom pobune ni nakon nje. Stranke su se potom podložile sudu

⁶⁵ Za nevezane slučajeve raspravljane na shodu vidi MNL OL, DL 100365; 103483; ZsO, II/2 5968; 5976; Laszowski 1904: 261, MNL OL, D1 42959; 34294.

⁶⁶ ZsO, II/2, 6072.

⁶⁷ Svi takvi sporovi neće se temeljito pretresati; stoga v. MNL OL, DL 100367; ili slučaj koji je započeo na shodu pa nastavljen pred palatinom, MNL OL, DL 100366.

⁶⁸ Šišić 1938: 295–300. U još jednom slučaju vraćanje posjeda se zahtijevalo pozivom na dodijeljenu posebnu milost, ali ona nije dobivena sukladno dekretu, već nakon isteka za to određenog roka, pa je posjed ostao u rukama primatelja darovnice, MNL OL, DL 288468.

KRIŽEVCI ASSEMBLY OF 1408

Presided by the king, the assembly for Križevci and Virovitica Counties began on 13 February. Although they were not the only disputes being settled at the assembly, the cases dating back to 1403 dominate in the sources preserved.⁶⁵ Some of them were not about loyalty or disloyalty – it was taken for granted – but rather about finding a *modus vivendi* between the parties who had been dispossessed and those who had been donated their estates.⁶⁶ There are several cases at the core of which was the problem of telling rebels from loyal noblemen; these cases are of particular interest for this paper.⁶⁷ An identical pattern can be found in the dispute between Nicholas (son of Vlatko) and Nicholas of *Newna* and in the one between Paul of Desnica (son of Dominic) and his cousins Blaise, Andrew, Gal and Paul of Desnica. At the assembly, Nicholas and Paul claimed they had abided by the requirements of the royal pardon offered in October, substantiating their claim with charters of pardon. The other party to the case submitted royal donations and Chapter's certificates of introduction into possession. The opposing claims, whose substance revolved about the question of someone's behavior after the offer of pardon in October, was resolved in such a way that the parties to the case agreed to accept the ruling of the sworn assessors. As the assessors in both cases testified that the damaged parties had been unjustly convicted, they were given their estates back.⁶⁸ Besides the cases in which the parties tried to substantiate their claims with written evidence, there were also those in which the parties did not offer any written evidence for their claims of unjust dispossession. For example,

⁶⁵ For other cases tried at the assembly, see MNL OL, DL 100365; 103483; ZsO, II/2 5968; 5976; Laszowski 1904: 261, MNL OL, D1 42959; 34294.

⁶⁶ ZsO, II/2, 6072.

⁶⁷ As not all such cases will be discussed in detail here, see MNL OL, DL 100367, or a case that was initiated at the assembly but was continued before the palatine, MNL OL, DL 100366.

⁶⁸ Šišić 1938: 295–300. There was another case where repossession of an estate was required. In that case, the dispossessed party had been given a special pardon, but only after expiry of the deadline specified in the decree, so the estate had remained in the hands of the party who had been awarded it, MNL OL, DL 288468.

prisežnika, koji su utvrdili kako Ivan i Jakov nisu bili nevjerni te su im posjedi vraćeni. Izuzetak je bio posjedovni dio Ivanova oca, no zauzvrat je Nikola Martinov osuđen *in omagis ipsius pro indebita autem inpeticione*.⁶⁹ Sličan je bio i slučaj Ladislava i Ivana Pekrija, kako se otkriva u Sigismundovoj ispravi iz 1414. U veljači te godine pred Žigmunda je došao Ladislav te rekao kako su na općem saboru održanom pod predsjedanjem kralja u Križevcima prisežnici svjedočili kako on, njegov brat i majka nisu bili nevjerni. Kako su Ladislav i Ivan tada bili maloljetni, a majka pritisnuta starošću, isprave izdane na shodu o njihovoj nevinosti ostavljene su na čuvanje kraljevskom dvoru, to jest kraljevskom protonotaru. Međutim, kada je Ladislav tražio na dvoru da mu se isprave vrate, njegovoj se zamolbi nije moglo udovoljiti jer ih protonotar nije mogao pronaći. Da bi se stvar raščistila, kralj je uputio nalog palatinu Nikoli Gorjanskom, s imenima prisežnika iz 1408. kod kojih se trebala provjeriti istinitost Ladislavovih tvrdnji, zahvaljujući čemu imamo prvi put barem djelomičan popis prisežnika s nekog općeg shoda u Slavoniji. Na kraljevu molbu Nikola je u svoju utvrdu Šikloš sazvaao one koji su tada još bili živi, Pavla Bisena, Ladislava Mihovilova *de Zenthberthalam*, Jurja Petrova *de Dombo*, Ladislava Dominikova *de Apostagh* te Opoja od Rasinje, koji su ponovno prisegnuli u nevinost navedenih Pekrija.⁷⁰ Posljednji slučaj koji ću istaknuti tiče se već poznatih aktera, Ladislava i Nikole *de Iweloucha*. Naime, Dominik, sada kraljev *sartor*, nije odustajao od svojih presizanja na njihov posjed pa ih je optužio da su ga izbacili iz posjeda. Na to su Ladislav i Nikola priložili prethodno razmatranu Hermanovu ispravu od 20. lipnja, u kojoj je bila prepisana kraljevska isprava od 2. lipnja, pri

John (son of Philip) and Jacob of *Butkhafelde* (son of John) accused Nicholas of *Syrimio* (son of Martin and retainer of Paul of Bissen), that he had requested from the king to award him their estates on account of their alleged disloyalty – which the king did, according to the royal charters presented to the assembly by Stephen of Bissen. But the *Butkhafelde* noblemen explained that John had disassociated himself from his father (whose participation in the revolt had not been denied) and that he had served under Martin Ders, while Jacob claimed he had never been disloyal in the first place – neither during nor after the revolt. The parties then submitted themselves to the sworn assessors' ruling. The assessors established that neither John nor Jacob had been disloyal and their estates were returned to them. The only exception was the property owned by John's father; in return, Nicholas (son of Martin) was sentenced *in omagis ipsius pro indebita autem inpeticione*.⁶⁹ Similar was the case of Ladislaus and John Pekri, as can be seen in Sigismund's charter from 1414. Ladislaus appeared before Sigismund in February that year, explaining that at the general assembly in Križevci, presided by the king, sworn assessors testified that he, his brother and his mother had not been rebels. As Ladislaus and John were minors at the time and their mother was incapacitated by old age, the charters on their innocence issued at the assembly were left for safekeeping by the protonotary at the royal court. However, when Ladislaus came to the court to obtain these documents, the protonotary could not find them. In order to shed light on the whole thing, the king gave the palatine Nicholas Garai a list of the sworn assessors from 1408, instructing him to investigate Ladislaus' claims. As a result of this, for the first time, we now have a list – if incomplete – of assessors from a general assembly in Slavonia. At the

⁶⁹ MNL OL, DL 230875. Sporovi vezani za plemiće *de Butkhafelde* otkrivaju jedan obrazac kako su Sigismundovi pobornici zlouporabili svoj položaj i kraljevska darivanja. Nema naznaka da su Baltazar, Petar, Jakov, Filip i Demetar sinovi Korhardusa, čiji su posjedi početkom studenog 1403. darovani Nikoli Martinovom, uspjeli steći kraljevu milost, to jest Nikola je stekao njihove posjede, što mu je onda predstavljalo odskočnu dasku da se, kako pokazuju drugi sporovi, proširi i na posjede njihove rodbine, kojima su posjedi vraćeni 1406. na temelju registra, to jest na shodu 1408.

⁷⁰ MNL OL, DL 100395.

⁶⁹ MNL OL, DL 230875. The disputes in which the *Butkhafelde* noblemen were involved reveal a pattern of abuse of privilege and royal donations by Sigismund's supporters. There is no evidence that Balthasar, Peter, Jacob, Philip and Demetrius (sons of Korhardus), whose states were awarded to Nicholas (son of Martin) in early November 1403, managed to receive royal pardon. This means that Nicholas acquired their estates (as evidenced in other disputes), using them as a stepping-stone for spreading to those of their kinsmen, to whom their estates were returned in 1406 (based on the register), which was confirmed at the assembly of 1408.

čemu valja ponoviti da se u obje spominje registar, to jest odluka o njihovom ponašanju za krize donijeta je na temelju registra. No, u kraljevskoj ispravi iz 1408., u prepričavanju tih dvaju isprava uopće se ne spominje registar. U kraljevskoj se ispravi navodi kako su Ladislav i Nikola bili premladi kako bi počinili nevjeru pa da je to razlog što je kralj poslao nalog banu da im vrati to jest uvede ih u posjed!⁷¹ Ovaj slučaj, kao i oni prethodno razmatrani zapravo pogađaju u samu bit problema koje je registar trebao rješavati, pa se odmah nameće pitanje što se to dogodilo s registrom nakon što je dopremljen u Slavoniju početkom lipnja 1406.? Drugim riječima, zašto je nemoguće razaznati korištenje registra na shodu iz 1408.? Nažalost, nema nikakvih informacija koje bi dopustile iznošenje pretpostavki koje ne bi vrlo brzo završile u sferi pukog nagađanja, pa ta pitanja ostaju potpuno otvorena. No, bez obzira na to valja podcrtati nekoliko zapažanja o shodu 1408.

Šire politički kontekst u kojem se odvijao shod bio je obilježen politikom dvora prema Bosni, to jest prema Hrvoju Vukčiću Hrvatiniću kao najvažnijem političkom akteru na prostoru Bosne i Hrvatske, štoviše to je bio period u kojem se pripremao veliki pohod sredinom iste godine. Pritom dakle opet valja istaknuti položaj Slavonije kao graničnog područja i s time povezanu njezinu stratešku osjetljivost. Naznaka kraljeva nezadovoljstva dotadašnjim rješenjima u Slavoniji vidi se iz smjene Hermana s banske pozicije upravo negdje početkom godine, koja je ostala nepopunjena. Velika promjena u upravljanju Slavonijom uslijedila je prepuštanjem najvećeg dijela banskog honorara u Slavoniji kraljici Barbari, no ona je u njihov posjed ušla 1409., pa je vjerojatno takva odluka bila donijeta tek iza pobjede pod Dobrom, koja je potpuno redefinirala Sigismundov

king's request, Nicholas summoned to his Fort Siklous all the surviving assessors: Paul of Bissen, Ladislaus of Zenthberthalam (son of Michael), George of Dombo (son of Peter), Ladislaus of Apostagh (son of Dominic) and Opoj of Rasinja. They solemnly swore again that the Pekris were innocent.⁷⁰ The last case I am discussing here is the one involving the already known protagonists – Ladislaus and Nicholas of Iwelouch. Dominic, now king's sartor, wasn't giving up his claims on their estate, so he accused them of dispossessing him. Ladislaus and Nicholas responded by submitting the earlier discussed Herman's charter of 2 June, which included a rewritten copy of the royal charter of 2 June. We should reiterate here that both of them mention the register. In other words, in 1406 the decision on their behavior during the crisis was made on the basis of the register. And yet, a royal charter from 1408 – which retells the contents of these two charters – does not mention the register at all. This royal charter states that Ladislaus and Nicholas were too young to rebel and that this was the reason why the king ordered the *ban* to reintroduce them into the possession of their estate!⁷¹ Just like the cases discussed earlier, this case goes to the very heart of the problem that the register was supposed to solve. This begs the question what happened to the register after it was brought to Slavonia in early June 1406? In other words, why is there no evidence that the register was used at the assembly of 1408? Unfortunately, there is no information that would allow solid assumptions instead of guessing, so these questions remain open. Still, some facts about the assembly of 1408 deserve to be underlined.

The political context of the assembly was marked by the court's Bosnian policy and its policy towards Hrvoje Vukčić Hrvatinić, the most prominent political protagonist in Bosnia and Croatia. It was also the period in which a large military campaign was

⁷¹ MNL OL, DL 32764 *Nos enim agnita denique teneram eorum etatem ad committendam infidelitatem aliquam factis vel consiliis seu auxiliis habentes extitissent et ex eo serenitas nostra iura eorum possessionaria ipsi Dominico sartori ratione prima dare minime valuisset nos enim aginta denique immaturitate et puerilli isporum etate predictas eorum possessions ipsis per spectabilem et magnificum virum dominum Hermann pro tunc banum eidem litteratoria scribendo restatui fecissemus.*

⁷⁰ MNL OL, DL 100395.

⁷¹ MNL OL, DL 32764 "Nos enim agnita denique teneram eorum etatem ad committendam infidelitatem aliquam factis vel consiliis seu auxiliis habentes extitissent et ex eo serenitas nostra iura eorum possessionaria ipsi Dominico sartori ratione prima dare minime valuisset nos enim aginta denique immaturitate et puerilli isporum etate predictas eorum possessions ipsis per spectabilem et magnificum virum dominum Hermann pro tunc banum eidem litteratoria scribendo restatui fecissemus."

autoritet i moć na jugu *Archiregnum*-a.⁷² Nadalje, samo održavanje shoda, najavljenog još krajem 1405. također ukazuje da su lokalne prilike zahtijevale posebnu pozornost. Da se jedan od temeljnih problema ticao upravo posljedica krize iz 1403., osim po značajnom broju prethodno navedenih, sačuvanih slučajeva vezanih za to, indikator je i odluka da se shod održi samo za Križevačku i Virovitičku županiju, a ne za cijelu Slavoniju – dovoljno se prisjetiti da takvih slučajeva praktično nije bilo u zagrebačkoj županiji da se razumije takva odluka. Odlučnost da se peripetije oko posljedica 1403. okončaju, vidljiva kroz sazivanje shoda – pri čemu se jasno razaznaje impuls odozdo za takvo postupanje – prema sačuvanim materijalima urodila je plodom. Odnosno, nakon 1408. nema naznaka, iako ima nekoliko pojedinačnih slučajeva, da su posljedice 1403. tako snažno utjecale na lokalne prilike, to jest zaključno s 1408. popriličan nered stvoren na lokalnoj razini kao posljedica krize bio je razriješen. Shod je naravno bio tek jedan korak u tom procesu, odnosno teško je predvidjeti ulogu registra u tome procesu, što zahtjeva još jedno fokusiranje na registar kao administrativno sredstvo, ali sada kroz prizmu jednog drugog registra, također vezanog za posljedice 1403.

REGISTAR NEVJERNIH U UGARSKOJ

U rujnu 1415. pred kraljevskim sudom našao se spor dvojice plemića iz županije Zale oko posjeda Kysthomay u istoj županiji, korijeni kojeg su se vukli još od 1403., kao posljedica oduzimanja posjeda na račun lèse-majesté. Jedna od strana u sporu tvrdila je da je njezin otac dobio kraljevu posebnu milost, no kako su mu te isprave oduzete, ali da se njegova tvrdnja može provjeriti u *registro nostro regali in domo nostra thavernicali habito et super nominibus hominum infidelium nostrorum confecto*. Spor je potom nekoliko puta odgađan, uz naznaku da je tužitelj trebao konzultirati registar, što na kraju ipak nije učinjeno već je presuda donijeta na drugim osnovama.⁷³ Jednako kao i

planned for the middle of that year. It is worth noting again here that Slavonia was a borderland and, as such, strategically sensitive. The fact that Herman was replaced as the *ban* earlier that year and that no new *ban* was appointed suggests that the king was not satisfied with the up-to-then solutions in Slavonia. A major change in the administration of Slavonia took place when most of the ban's honor in the region was transferred to Queen Barbara. However, as she took it over in 1409, it is likely that such a decision was made only after the victory at the Battle of Dobor, which completely redefined Sigismund's authority and power in the southern parts of the *Archiregnum*.⁷² Also, the mere fact that the assembly, announced way back in late 1405, took place indicates that the local situation demanded special attention. Besides the considerable number of the abovementioned related cases known today, another indicator that one of the fundamental problems was the aftermath of the 1403 crisis is the decision that the assembly should take place for Križevci and Virovitica Counties only, and not for the entire Slavonia. For understanding such decision, one should remember that there were only a few known rebels in Zagreb County. According to the sources preserved, the resolve to deal with the aftermath of 1403 and its troubles, manifested by convening the assembly – and with a visible bottom-up impulse for such action – came to fruition. With the exception of a few individual cases, there are no indications that the consequences of 1403 kept affecting the local state of affairs so strongly after 1408. In other words, the large mess created at the local level as a result of the crisis was finally dealt with in 1408. As the assembly was but a single step in that process, the role of the register should be stressed once again, which is why we should focus on the register as an administrative instrument once again, but this time through the prism of another register, also associated with the aftermath of 1403.

THE REGISTER OF REBELS IN THE KINGDOM OF HUNGARY

In September 1415, two noblemen from Zala County submitted to the royal court their dispute about Kysthomay estate in the same county. The

⁷² Za preuzimanje banskog honora 1409. v. Engel 1996: 16; Pálosfalvi 2006: 296.

⁷³ ZsO, V, dok. 1031.

⁷² For the 1409 transfer of the ban's honor, see Engel 1996: 16; Pálosfalvi 2006: 296.

„slavonski“ registar, ni ovome nije posvećeno odveć puno pažnje.⁷⁴ No, za razliku od slavonskog, daleko je teže razaznati kada i kako je nastao ovaj registar, te kako je uopće izgledao, kakve informacije je sadržavao. Put k razumijevanju tog registra, jednako kao i slavonskog, u prvom se redu prirodno sastojao u pokušaja pronalaska drugih mogućih spomena registra nevjernih. Taj put pak vremenski nije išao dublje u prošlost od 1409., što može izgledati na prvu ruku čudno s obzirom na to da se radi o punih šest godina nakon izbijanja krize koja se, kao što smo vidjeli, u Slavoniji rješavala između ostalog i izradom registra. No problem razdvajanja vjernih i nevjernih i dalje je bio aktualan kako se vidi iz Sigismundovih isprava upućenih u travnju 1409. prema županijama Szatmár, Máramaros, Ugocsa, Zenmplem i Ung u kojima se najavljuje da će se održati opći shodovi na kojima će se provjeravati valjanost kraljevskih isprava koje su izdali njegovi prethodnici, obračunati s lokalnim notornim zločincima te, što je za ovaj rad najvažnije, provjeravati tko je među nevjernima od kralja dobio isprave o milosti.⁷⁵ Agenda postavljena tada rezultirat će zapravo nevjerojatnom brojkom shodova održanih u županijama na prostoru cijele Ugarske, i to u periodu od travnja 1409. do svibnja 1410., za koje se sve bez iznimke navodi kako ih se održava *ex speciali regio edicto/mandato*. Taj zadatak dobrim je dijelom stavljen u ruke novog *iudex-a curie*, Simona Rozgonyija, no uključit će daleko širi broj ljudi: Pétra Perényija, Nikolu Csaka, Pipa Ozoru, Ivana Nassija, Simona Szécsényija sina Kónyae, Lászlóa Rozgonya, Matu Pálócija, Mihalya Nadasija, Ladislava de Asszonyfalvaija te samog kralja (shodovi za županije Fejer i Požegu). Takva gustoća općih shodova i aktivnosti naravno nije promakla pažnji povjesničara, no kao da njezine reperkusije nisu u potpunosti shvaćene.⁷⁶ Služeći se podacima koje nude radovi G. Istványija i N. Tótha te dodatnim uvidom u izvorni materijal, dobiva se zaista impresivna slika aktivnosti definiranih

dispute had its roots in 1403, when the estate was confiscated on account of *lèse-majesté*. One of the parties to the dispute claimed that his father had received a special royal pardon. He also said that the charter confirming it had been taken away from him but that the claim could be verified in “registro nostro regali in domo nostra thavernicali habito et super nominibus hominum infidelium nostrorum confecto”. The court proceedings were postponed several times with a remark that the complaining party should have consulted the register. Eventually, it did not happen and the sentence was passed on a different basis.⁷³ Just like the “Slavonian” register, this register has not drawn particular attention.⁷⁴ But unlike for the Slavonian one, it is much harder for this register to establish when and how was it made, what it looked like and what information did it contain. Naturally, the attempts to understand this register, just like in the case of the Slavonian, primarily consisted of a search for all the mentions of the Register of Rebels. At first it may sound strange that, chronologically, this search went back no further than to 1409, as many as six years after the beginning of the crisis that in Slavonia, as we have seen, had been dealt with by making of the register, among other things. However, as we can see from the Sigismund’s charters sent in April 1409 to Szatmár, Máramaros, Ugocsa, Zenmplem and Ung Counties, the problem of telling the rebels from the loyal noblemen still existed at the time. These charters announced general assemblies at which the validity of royal charters issued by the king’s predecessors would be verified, local notorious criminals would be dealt with and, most importantly for this paper, the rebels who received pardon charters from the king would be identified.⁷⁵ The agenda set at the time would result in an incredible number of assemblies convened in counties throughout the Kingdom of Hungary between April 1409 and May 1410. For all of them without exception, it is specified that they are taking place *ex speciali regio edicto/mandato*. Simon Rozgonyi, the new *iudex curie*, was entrusted with most of this task, but many other people will also be

⁷⁴ Dvořáková 2010: 94, koja lakonski veli da je taj registar bio dostupan dugo nakon ustanka 1403., izgleda predmnijevajući da je tada i nastao.

⁷⁵ Tóth 2019; ZsO II/2, 6716, 6717.

⁷⁶ V. radove Istványija 1941; Tóth 2010.

⁷³ ZsO, V, doc. 1031.

⁷⁴ Dvořáková 2010: 94, who laconically claims that this register was available for a long time after the revolt of 1403, probably believing that it was created in that year.

⁷⁵ Tóth 2019; ZsO II/2, 6716, 6717.

agendom oblikovanom na dvoru. Podatci koje ću iznijeti nemaju za cilj iscrpnost, već će samo – uz neke iznimke – sadržavati mjesto, to jest županiju održavanja shoda te mjesec.⁷⁷ Niz započinje u travnju 1409. kada se održava shod za županije Pest i Pilis,⁷⁸ Fejer (travanj),⁷⁹ Heves (svibanj),⁸⁰ Veszprem (svibanj),⁸¹ Saros (svibanj),⁸² Borsod (svibanj),⁸³ Somogy (lipanj),⁸⁴ požešku županiju (srpanj),⁸⁵ Szabolcs (srpanj),⁸⁶ Gomormegye (srpanj),⁸⁷ Bihar (kolovoz),⁸⁸ Abauj (kolovoz),⁸⁹ Chanad (kolovoz),⁹⁰ Zemplen (rujan),⁹¹ Tolnu (rujan),⁹² Ung (rujan),⁹³ Hont i Nograd (rujan),⁹⁴ Szathmar i Ugosca (listopad),⁹⁵ Kraszna (listopad),⁹⁶ potom shod za Sekelje (prosinac),⁹⁷ županiju Bereg (veljača 1410.)⁹⁸ te Sopron (svibanj)⁹⁹. Najveća aktivnost se primjećuje na prostoru sjeverozapadne Ugarske, no shodovi su se zapravo održavali u svim dijelovima kraljevstva. Također, imajući na umu problem sačuvanosti izvornog materijala, može se postaviti pitanje nisu li shodovi održani i u nekim drugim županijama za koje informacije nisu sačuvane. Drugim riječima, može se naslutiti da se agendom postavljenom na dvoru zapravo smjeralo održati shodove u

involved: Péter Perényi, Nicholas Csak, Pipo Ozora, John Nassi, Simon Szécsényi (son of Kónya), László Rozgonyi, Matthew Pálóci, Mihaly Nadasi, Ladislaus of Asszonyfalvai and the king himself (the assemblies for Fejer and Požega Counties). Naturally, historians did not fail to notice such density of general assemblies and activities. However, it seems that they did not manage to grasp fully the repercussions of it.⁷⁶ The information from the works by G. Istványi and N. Tóth and a deeper insight into the original sources provide a truly impressive glimpse into the activities defined by the agenda set by the court. The following information does not aim at being comprehensive; instead – with some exceptions – it will merely contain the place (county) and month of a particular assembly.⁷⁷ The series of assemblies begins in April 1409, with the assemblies for Pest and Pilis Counties,⁷⁸ followed by Fejer (April),⁷⁹ Heves (May),⁸⁰ Veszprem (May),⁸¹ Saros (May);⁸² Borsod (May),⁸³ Somogy (June),⁸⁴ Požega (July),⁸⁵ Szabolcs (July),⁸⁶ Gomormegye (July),⁸⁷ Bihar (August),⁸⁸ Abauj (August),⁸⁹ Chanad (August),⁹⁰ Zemplen (September),⁹¹ Tolnu (September),⁹² Ung (September),⁹³ Hont and Nograd (September),⁹⁴ Szathmar and Ugosca (October),⁹⁵ Kraszna (October),⁹⁶ Sekelje (December),⁹⁷

⁷⁷ U nastavku radi praktičnosti navodim samo izvorni materijal, uz naznaku kako su dva rada bila neophodna u kompiliranju.

⁷⁸ ZsO, II/2, 6734.

⁷⁹ ZsO, II/2, 26749, 6752.

⁸⁰ ZsO, II/2, 26768, 6771.

⁸¹ ZsO, II/2, 6774.

⁸² ZsO, II/2, 6787.

⁸³ ZsO, II/2, 6789, 6798, 6804, 6805, 6807, 6811.

⁸⁴ ZsO, II/2, 6836.

⁸⁵ ZsO, II/2, 6862.

⁸⁶ ZsO, II/2, 6892.

⁸⁷ ZsO, II/2, 6942.

⁸⁸ ZsO, II/2, 6956.

⁸⁹ ZsO, II/2, 6967.

⁹⁰ ZsO, II/2, 6983.

⁹¹ ZsO, II/2, 7015.

⁹² ZsO, II/2, 7018, 7022.

⁹³ ZsO, II/2, 7081.

⁹⁴ ZsO, II/2, 7088.

⁹⁵ ZsO, II/2, 7015, 7115, 7123, 7130, 7279

⁹⁶ ZsO, II/2, 7155.

⁹⁷ ZsO, II/2, 7219.

⁹⁸ ZsO, II/2, 7340, 7360, 7367.

⁹⁹ ZsO, II/2, 7628.

⁷⁶ See the works of Istványi 1941; Tóth 2010.

⁷⁷ For the purpose of practicality, I'll be citing only the original sources further in the text, while noting that two papers were essential for the compiling.

⁷⁸ ZsO, II/2, 6734.

⁷⁹ ZsO, II/2, 26749, 6752.

⁸⁰ ZsO, II/2, 26768, 6771.

⁸¹ ZsO, II/2, 6774

⁸² ZsO, II/2, 6787.

⁸³ ZsO, II/2, 6789, 6798, 6804, 6805, 6807, 6811.

⁸⁴ ZsO, II/2, 6836.

⁸⁵ ZsO, II/2, 6862.

⁸⁶ ZsO, II/2, 6892.

⁸⁷ ZsO, II/2, 6942.

⁸⁸ ZsO, II/2, 6956,

⁸⁹ ZsO, II/2, 6967.

⁹⁰ ZsO, II/2, 6983.

⁹¹ ZsO, II/2, 7015.

⁹² ZsO, II/2, 7018, 7022.

⁹³ ZsO, II/2, 7081.

⁹⁴ ZsO, II/2, 7088.

⁹⁵ ZsO, II/2, 7015, 7115, 7123, 7130, 7279

⁹⁶ ZsO, II/2, 7155.

⁹⁷ ZsO, II/2, 7219.

svakom kutku, to jest županiji kraljevstva.¹⁰⁰ Budući da je jedna od njihovih funkcija bilo obračunavanje s *malefactores*, ne čudi da su sačuvani i neki registri u koji su unošena njihova imena.¹⁰¹ Tu valja naglasiti da se u njihovu uvodu naročito navodi da je riječ o popisu notornih zločinaca, to jest uz zločine tamo navedenih osoba ne spominje se *nota infidelitatis*.¹⁰² No, drugi cilj, provjera nevjernih i kraljevskih isprava o milosti, također je uključivao izradu registra. Najjasnije se to vidi iz primjera spora vođenog pred kraljem 1413. kada je jedna od strana u sporu pokazala registar Simona Rozgonyija u koji su bila unesena imena nevjernih koja su iznijeli prisežnici na shodu za županiju Bereg, čime je strana u sporu dokazivala svoju tvrdnju da je optuženik za krize 1403. bio familijar određenog plemića te da su oba bila optužena za nevjeru.¹⁰³ Naznake da su takvi registri rađeni i u drugim županijama dolaze i iz slučaja županije Heves.¹⁰⁴ Nažalost, ta je isprava, izdana

¹⁰⁰ Može se nazrijeti i za Zalu, kako upućuje spor u kojem se spominje registar nevjernih u tavernikalnom domu, kao i za Nyitru, MNL OL, DL 49169. Teško je razaznati spadaju li u ovaj niz i neki kasniji shodovi, poput onoga za županiju Bodrog koji se spominje u studenome 1410., u kojem kralj daje nalog mačvanskim banovima da donesu konačnu presudu u jednom slučaju koji se tiče *notae infidelitatis*, Apponyi 1906: 263.

¹⁰¹ V. Tringli 1997: 399, bilj. 66.

¹⁰² MNL OL, DL 283047.

¹⁰³ MNL OL, DL 10022: „... exhibitionem cuiusdam registri capite sigilli prefati comitis Symonis de Rozgon consignati nomina infidelium nostre maiestatis per iuratos assessores congregationis generalis prefati comitis Symonis de Rozgon feria quarta proxima ante festum purificationis virginis gloriose anno domini millesimo quadringentesimo decimo prope opidum Zaz universitati nobilium comitatus de Beregh per ipsum ex speciali nostre maiestatis commissione celebrate extradatorum seriatim in se continentes, familiarem dicti Johannis filii Georgii Jakch extitisse ac cum eodem in prescriptis regni nostri disturbiorum temporibus contra nostram maiestatem infideliter processisse declarando.“

¹⁰⁴ To se može naslutiti za još jedan slučaj koji se ticao shoda održanog pod predsjedanjem Stribora za Nyitru, koji se spominje u kraljevskoj ispravi iz srpnja 1411.; iz Stiborova itenerara da se naslutiti da je shod održan negdje između svibnja i rujna 1410., kada je zabilježena njegova prisutnost na tom području. Dvořáková 2010: 550. Spor koji se spominje ticao se reperkusija *note infidelitatis* i kraljevske milosti, a jedna od strana svoj je slučaj željela braniti i putem *regestra in generali congregatione predicti comitatus confecta*, MNL OL, DL 49169.

Bereg (February 1410)⁹⁸ and Sopron (May)⁹⁹. The most intensive activity can be seen in northwestern part of the Hungary, but assemblies took place in almost all parts of the kingdom. As the original sources may not have been completely preserved, there is a possibility that assemblies also took place in some other counties. In other words, there are indications that a part of the court's agenda was to convene assemblies in almost every corner – every county – of the Kingdom.¹⁰⁰ As dealing with *malefactores* was one of the functions of the assemblies, it is no surprise that the registers containing their names that were made at some of these assemblies have been preserved.¹⁰¹ In the introductions to these registers it is expressly explained that these are the lists of notorious criminals, that is *nota infidelitatis* is not mentioned among the crimes associated with these persons.¹⁰² The other goal – verification of rebels and control of royal pardon charters, also included the making of a register. It is clearly observed in a case presented to the king in 1413, when one of the parties submitted the register of Simon Rozgonyi containing the names of rebels as cited by the assessors at the assembly for Bereg County. The party used the register to substantiate their claim that the accused was retainer of a certain nobleman during the crisis of 1403 and that both of them had been accused of disloyalty.¹⁰³ A case from

⁹⁸ ZsO, II/2, 7340, 7360, 7367.

⁹⁹ ZsO, II/2, 7628.

¹⁰⁰ A case in which a register of rebels kept in the home of the *magister tavarnicorum* indicates that such assemblies were also convened for Zala, and for Nytra County, see MNL OL, DL 49169. It is hard to establish if some later assemblies can be included in this series of assemblies (such as the one for Bodrog County mentioned in November 1410, where the king orders the bans of Mačva to pass a final verdict in a case that included *notae infidelitatis*), Apponyi 1906: 263.

¹⁰¹ See Tringli 1997: 399, n. 66.

¹⁰² MNL OL, DL 283047.

¹⁰³ MNL OL, DL 10022: „... exhibitionem cuiusdam registri capite sigilli prefati comitis Symonis de Rozgon consignati nomina infidelium nostre maiestatis per iuratos assessores congregationis generalis prefati comitis Symonis de Rozgon feria quarta proxima ante festum purificationis virginis gloriose anno domini millesimo quadringentesimo decimo prope opidum Zaz universitati nobilium comitatus de Beregh per ipsum ex speciali nostre maiestatis commissione celebrate extradatorum seriatim in se continentes, familiarem dicti Johannis filii Georgii Jakch extitisse ac cum eodem in prescriptis regni nostri disturbiorum temporibus contra nostram maiestatem infideliter processisse declarando.“

1409., oštećena. No ipak je vidljivo da su prisežnici na shodu predali registar za koji se ne veli direktno da je registar nevjernih, ali se spominje registar u koji su na temelju svjedočanstva prisežnika unesena imena dvojice plemića koji su bili osuđeni za nevjeru. Na to su pak njih dvojica pred Rozgonyija i Simona Konyu, koji su presjedali shodom, donijeli kraljevske isprave o podijeljenoj milosti.¹⁰⁵ Ta dva slučaja pružaju uvid u mehanizam nastajanja registra na lokalnoj razini, pri čemu se zapravo replicira postupak nastajanja registra s popisom notornih zločinaca, gdje su prisežnici davali predsjedatelju popis osoba, u ovom slučaju nevjernih. No ranije razmatrani registar, za koji se kaže da se čuvao *in domo tavernicali*, nije sadržavao samo popis nevjernih već i onih koji su dobili milost. Zajedno sa slučajem iz Berega, to navodi na pomisao da su nakon nastanka popisa koji su sastavljali prisežnici informacije u njemu revidirane, ovisno je li tko s njega mogao dokazati svoju nevinost putem valjane kraljevske isprave o milosti.¹⁰⁶ Drugim riječima, osnova cijele zamisli bila je prikupljanje informacija na lokalnoj razini putem održavanja shodova koje su potom integrirane u jedan središnji registar, nastao dakle negdje na samom početku 1410-ih, za koji je teško precizno naslutiti kako je bio uređen, ali koji je očito sadržavao informacije o onima koji su dobili kraljevsku milost te onima koji nisu bili te sreće, i to na razini cijelog kraljevstva. U konačnici, makar je riječ praktično o samo jednom spomenu tog registra, činjenica da se na njega pozivalo, govori da je njegovo postojanje bilo dobro poznato među plemstvom, što i ne čudi ako se uzme u obzir da je njegov nastanak ovisio o mogućnosti intervencije središnje vlasti u lokalno znanje i prilike.

¹⁰⁵ MNL OL, DL 28140.

¹⁰⁶ Ili, kako to pokazuje jedan slučaj, čak i ako se nije moglo pokazati isprave o milosti, lžagu nevjere i gubitak posjeda moglo se sa sebe skinuti preuzimanjem obveze vojne službe, to jest polaska na predstojeći pohod s Pipom od Ozore, ZsO, II/2, 6924.

Heves County also indicates that such registers were made in other counties.¹⁰⁴ Unfortunately, the relevant charter issued in 1409 is damaged. However, one can still read in it that the assessors submitted a register, and while it is not expressly said that it is a register of rebels, it is mentioned that the names of two noblemen sentenced as rebels were entered in it based on the assessors' testimonies. The two responded by submitting to Rozgonyi and Simon Konya, who presided the assembly, the royal pardon charters issued to them.¹⁰⁵ These two cases illustrate how the register was made at the local level; it was actually the same procedure as the one used for the making of the registers of notorious criminals. It was the sworn assessors who would submit the list – in this case, of rebels – to the person presiding the assembly. However, the above discussed register, said to have been kept *in domo tavernicali*, contained not only a list of rebels, but also a list of those who had received royal pardon. Together with the Bereg case, this suggests that, after the assessors had made the list, changes would be introduced in it if some of the listed noblemen managed to prove their innocence with a valid royal pardon charter.¹⁰⁶ In other words, the idea was to gather information at the local level by convening assemblies. Such information would then be integrated in a single central register, made at the very beginning of the 1410s. Its form is hard to reconstruct precisely, but it clearly contained information about the noblemen from all parts of the Kingdom who had received royal pardon and the ones who had not been that lucky. And finally, although we are talking about a single mention of this register here, the fact that it was

¹⁰⁴ Such indications are also found in another case presented at the assembly for Nytra, presided by Stribor, which is mentioned in a royal charter of July 1411; Stribor's itinerary suggests that the assembly took place between May and September 1410, when his presence in the area was noted. Dvořáková 2010: 550. The case in question concerned the repercussions of *note infidelitatis* and royal pardon; one of the parties involved wanted to make their case by referring to "registra in generali congregatione predicti comitatus confecta", MNL OL, DL 49169.

¹⁰⁵ MNL OL, DL 28140.

¹⁰⁶ Or, as one case shows, even if no pardon charter was submitted, one could clear their name, remove the stigma of disloyalty and avoid confiscation of their estates if one joined the military and participated in the forthcoming campaign together with Pipo of Ozora, ZsO, II/2, 6924.

ZAKLJUČAK

Za vladavine Anžuvina kraljevski aparat vlasti napravio je iskorak u korištenju pisane riječi kao osnove administrativnog djelovanja, naročito uporabom registara. U prvom redu odnosi se to na kontrolu produkcije same kraljevske kancelarije uvođenjem *libri regii* za Karla I.¹⁰⁷ Registri su također korišteni i za uređenje kraljevskih prava, poput registra koji se ticao kraljevine Hrvatske u drugoj polovini 14. stoljeća, ili su pak sadržavali informacije o posjedovnim pravima na razini županije, što se može naslutiti iz registra koji se ticao županije Liptó.¹⁰⁸ Sigismundov dvor u tom je pogledu naslijedio administrativne prakse temeljene na pisanoj riječi Anžuvina, ali je i proširio spektar uporabe registara kao specifične forme administrativnog djelovanja, što se vidi iz primjera ovdje razmatranih dvaju registara nevjernih. Slavonski registar nevjernih pokazuje da se postojeći repertoar – praksa unošenja imena notornih zločinaca koje su imenovali prisežnici na općim shodovima pojedinih županija – koristio u izvanrednim situacijama, istovremeno transformirajući njegovu namjenu i narav. Registar nevjernih za Ugarsku jednako je tako teško zamisliti bez slavenskog registra, pri čemu je vidljivo širenje repertoara tehnika vladanja, od *ad hoc* rješenja koja postaju, ako ne stalna i institucionalizirana, dio repertoara administrativnih praksi koje je moguće koristiti ovisno o potrebi.¹⁰⁹ Kada ih se uspoređi, „slavonski“ i „ugarski“ registar imaju jednu važnu sličnost. Oba su, naime, nastala djelovanjem prisežnika na općim shodovima, što se pokazuje kao jedan od najvažnijih foruma interakcije središnje vlasti i lokalnih društava. Prikupljanje informacija i djelovanje takvim kanalima pružalo je mogućnost intervencije središnjoj vlasti, ali na takav način da je pružala mogućnost očuvanja interesa lokalnih

referred to indicates that the nobility was well aware of its existence. This is no surprise if we take into account the fact that its making depended on the central government's ability to intervene in local affairs and local knowledge.

CONCLUSION

During the Angevine rule, the royal administrative apparatus made progress in using written word as the basis of administrative activities – registers in particular. This primarily refers to the control of the production of royal chancery by introducing *libri regii* during the reign of Charles I.¹⁰⁷ Registers were also used for regulation of the regalia, such as the register intended for the *regnum* of Croatia in the second half of the 14th century, or contained information about proprietary rights at the county level, as the register for Liptó County indicates.¹⁰⁸ In this, Sigismund's court inherited the Angevine administrative practice based on the written word, but it also extended the use of registers as a specific form of administrative activities, as can be seen from the examples of the two registers of rebels discussed here. The Slavonian register of rebels shows that the existing repertoire – the practice of entering the names of notorious criminals as named by assessors at general assemblies at the county level – was used in extraordinary situations, transforming its purpose and nature at the same time. The register of rebels for Kingdom of Hungary is hard to imagine without its Slavonian equivalent. Like the latter, the former also exhibited visible extension of the administration technique repertoire, from *ad hoc* solutions to administrative practices that, even though not permanent and institutionalized, could be used as needed.¹⁰⁹ There is one important similarity between the “Slavonian”

¹⁰⁷ Szende 2004: 114–117.

¹⁰⁸ Za Liptó: Fügedi 1986: 23; nemoguće je ovdje ulaziti u detalje rasprave Mladena Ančića i Mirjane Matijević Sokol oko tog registra; dostatno je tek naznačiti da je sasvim ispravan temeljni zaključak M. Ančića da je riječ o registru kraljevskih posjeda/prava, Matijević Sokol 2008: 237–257; Ančić 1998: 250–251; Ančić 2005: 12; Ančić 2007: 208–209; Ančić 2007a: 149.

¹⁰⁹ Za pretvaranje *ad hoc* rješenja u institucionalizirane prakse v. odličnu studiju Kittel 1991.

¹⁰⁷ Szende 2004: 114–117.

¹⁰⁸ For Liptó, see Fügedi 1986: 23; it is impossible to elaborate here on Mladen Ančić and Mirjana Matijević Sokol's discussion on this register; it suffices to say that M. Ančić's fundamental conclusion that it is a register of royal estates/rights is absolutely correct, Matijević Sokol 2008: 237–257; Ančić 1998: 250–251; Ančić 2005: 12; Ančić 2007: 208–209; Ančić 2007a: 149.

¹⁰⁹ For turning *ad hoc* solutions into institutionalized practice, see excellent study by Kittel 1991.

aktera. No osim sličnosti, dva registra obilježavaju znatne razlike. Dok je „slavonski“ nastao „jednokratnim“ djelovanjem, „ugarski“ je bio plod široko zasnovane agende koja je podrazumijevala intenzivan upliv središnje vlasti na razini cjelokupne Ugarske kroz impresivan niz održanih županijskih shodova. Razlike se očituju i u drugom aspektu. Dok je „slavonski“ registar svoju autentičnost temeljio na pet pečata koji su ga činili „zatvorenim“ dokumentom, dotle je „ugarski“ nastao na principu integracije pojedinih dijelova mozaika u jedan središnji registar te izgleda da je pritom revizija prikupljenih informacija bila ugrađena u njegov nastanak.

Administrativno djelovanje, koje uz to počiva na pisanoj riječi, specifičan je oblik ostvarivanja kraljevskog, u konkretnom slučaju Sigismundova, autoriteta.¹¹⁰ „Slavonski“ registar pokazuje da je taj autoritet bio ugrožen, naravno na potpuno drukčiji način, s dvije strane. S jedne su ga strane ugrožavali oni koji su se pobunili protiv Sigismunda, dok su s druge strane stajali oni koji su ga mogli ugroziti svojim djelovanjem prilikom uspostavljanja kraljeva autoriteta. Registar se u tom pogledu pokazao kao iznimno sredstvo vlasti, to jest kontrole podanika – odnosno načina da ih se pretvori u vjerne podanike – ali istovremeno i sredstvo uz pomoć kojeg se pozivalo na odgovornost one koji su poslani da u kraljevo ime vladaju tim istim podanicima i koji su beskrupulozno koristili to što su se nalazili na pobjedničkoj strani. Interes dvora za očuvanje reda u Slavoniji nakon uspostave kraljevskog autoriteta krajem 1403. i početkom 1404. pritom je dobrim dijelom proizlazio iz činjenice da je Slavonija predstavljala pogranično područje prema krajevima južno od Save, a koji su se uvelike nalazili pod kontrolom najopasnijeg Sigismundova protivnika u tim krajevima, Hrvoja Vukčića Hrvatinića.

and “Hungarian” registers. Both were made on the basis of the testimonies of the sworn assessors at general assemblies, which proved themselves as a very important forum for interactions between the central government and local societies. Gathering information and taking action through such channels enabled the central government to intervene, while the possibility for the local protagonists to protect their interest was still open. There were also substantial differences between the two registers. While the “Slavonian” register was a result of a “one-time” effort, the “Hungarian” one was a part of a comprehensive agenda that had implied central government’s intensive impact on the affairs of the entire kingdom through an impressive series of county assemblies. Another difference was that, while the “Slavonian” register’s authenticity was based on five seals that made it a “closed” document, the “Hungarian” register was created by integrating individual pieces of the mosaic into a single central register (and it seems that revision of the information thus obtained was included in its making).

Administrative activities based on written word constituted a specific form of royal – in this case Sigismund’s – authority.¹¹⁰ The “Slavonian” register shows that this authority was threatened from two sides – in a very different way, of course. It was threatened by those who revolted against Sigismund and by those who could jeopardize the king’s authority with their actions at the time when his authority was being established. This was yet another situation where the register proved itself as an exceptional instrument of administration – in other words, an instrument for controlling the subjects and keeping them loyal. It was also an instrument for holding to account all those who were supposed to rule these subjects in the king’s name but who unscrupulously used the fact that they had joined the winning side. Much of the court’s interest in keeping order in Slavonia after the royal authority had been established there in late 1403 and early 1404 was largely based on the fact that Slavonia was a borderland and that the regions south of the Sava river were under control of Sigismund’s most dangerous local adversary in these parts – Hrvoja Vukčić Hrvatinić.

¹¹⁰ Za administrativne prakse i autoritet v. na primjer izvrsnu studiju Given 2001.

¹¹⁰ For administrative practices and authority, see, for example, excellent study by Given 2001.

Bibliografija / Bibliography

- Ančić 1987 – Mladen Ančić, Gospodarski aspekti stočarstva cetinskog komitata u XIV st., *Acta historico-oeconomica Iugoslaviae*, 14, 1987, 69–98.
- Ančić 1996 – Mladen Ančić, Knin u razvijenom i kasnom srednjem vijeku, *Radovi Zavoda za povijesne znanosti HAZU u Zadru*, 38, 1996, 53–95.
- Ančić 1998 – Mladen Ančić, Desetljeće od 1091. do 1102. u zrcalu vrela, *Povijesni prilozi*, 17, 1998, 233–259.
- Ančić 2005 – Mladen Ančić, Splitski i zadarski kaptol kao „vjerodostojna mjesta“, *Registar Artukucija iz Rivignana, Srednjovjekovni registri Zadarskog i Splitskog kaptola*, sv. 1, Zagreb, 2005, 11–77.
- Ančić 2007 – Mladen Ančić, Architecture on Royal Domains in Northern Dalmatia, *Hortus artium medievalium*, 13/1, 2007, 203–210.
- Ančić 2007a – Mladen Ančić, Srednjovjekovno plemstvo na prostoru između Zrmanje i Neretve, u / in: *Dalmatinska zagora: nepoznata zemlja*, ed. V. Kusin, Zagreb: Ministarstvo kulture, Galerija Klovićevi dvori, 2007, 149–158.
- Ančić 2009 – Mladen Ančić, Od tradicije ‘sedam pobuna’ do dragovoljnih mletačkih podanika. Razvojna putanja Zadra u prvom desetljeću 15. stoljeća, *Povijesni prilozi*, 37, 2009, 43–96.
- Apponyi 1906 – *A Pécz nemzetség Apponyi ágának az Apponyi grófok családi levéltárában őrizett oklevelei. I. 1241–1526.*, Budapest.
- Bard 1978 – Imre Bard, Aristocratic Revolts and the Late Medieval Hungarian State, AD 1382-1408, doktorska disertacija (rukopis) / Ph. D. dissertation (manuscript), University of Washington, 1978.
- Dóry 1976 – Franciscus Dóry, *Decreta Regni Hungariae: Gesetze und Verordnungen Ungarns 1301–1457*, Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1976.
- DRMH – János M. Bak et al., *Decreta Regni Mediaevalis Hungariae. The Laws of the Medieval Kingdom of Hungary*, I-III., Charles Schlacks, Jr.: Idyllwild – Salt Lake City – Los Angeles, 1992-1999.
- Dvořáková 2010 – Daniela Dvořáková, *Rytier a jeho král: Stibor zo Stiboric a Žigmund Luxemburský*, Bratislava: Vydavateľstvo RAK, 2010.
- Engel & Tóth 2005 – Pál Engel & Norbert Tóth, *Itineraria regum et reginarum Hungariae (1382-1437)*, Budapest: Magyar Tudományos Akadémia, 2005.
- Engel 1996 – Pál Engel, *Magyarország világi archontológiája 1301-1457*, Budapest: MTA Történettudományi intézete, 1996.
- Engel 2001 – Pál Engel, *Realm of St. Stephen: A History of Medieval Hungary, 895-1526*, London: I. B. Tauris, 2001.
- Engel 2001a – Pál Engel, The Estates of the Hospitallers in Hungary at the End of the Middle Ages, u / in : *The Crusades and the military orders: Expanding the frontiers of medieval Latin Christianity*, eds. Z. Hunyadi & J. Laszlovszky, Budapest: Central European University, 2001, 291–302.
- Fügedi 1986 – Erik Fügedi, Verba Volant ... Oral Culture and Literacy among Medieval Hungarian Nobility, u / in : *Kings, Bishops, Nobles and Burghers in Medieval Hungary*, ed. J. M. Bak, London: Variorum Reprints, 1986, 1–25.
- Given 2001 – James B. Given, *Inquisition and Medieval Society: Power, Discipline, and Resistance in Languedoc*, Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 2001.
- Halász 2017 – Éva B. Halász, Generalis congregatiók Szlavóniában a 13-14. században, *Történelmi Szemle*, 59/2, 2017, 283–298.
- Hoensch 1996 – Jörg K. Hoensch, *Kaiser Sigismund: Herrscher an der Schwelle zur Neuzeit 1368-1437*, München: C. H. Beck Verlag, 1996.
- Hunyadi 2010 – Zsolt Hunyadi, *The Hospitallers in Medieval Kingdom of Hungary, c. 1150-1387*, Budapest: Magyar Egyháztörténeti Enciklopédia Munkaközösség, 2010.
- Istványi 1941 – Géza Istványi, A generalis congregatio (Második és befejező közlemény), *Levéltári közlemények*, 18–19, 1940-1941 (1941), 179–207.
- Karbić & Miljan 2012 – Damir Karbić & Suzana Miljan, Političko djelovanje kneza Pavla I. Zrinskog (1362.-1414.), *Zbornik Odsjeka za povijesne znanosti Zavoda za povijesne i društvene znanosti Hrvatske akademije znanosti i umjetnosti*, 30, 2012, 87–107.
- Kekez 2015 – Hrvoje Kekez, In the service of the mighty king: political relations between the counts of Blagaj and king Sigismund of Luxemburg, *Review of Croatian history*, 11, 2015, 7–46.
- Kittel 1991 – Ellen E. Kittell, *From Ad Hoc to Routine: A Case Study in Medieval Bureaucracy*, Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1991.
- Klaić 1985 – Vjekoslav Klaić, *Povijest Hrvata*, sv. 2, Zagreb: Matica hrvatska, 1985.

- Laszowski 1904 – Emilij Laszowski, Listine općine Sv. Jelene Koruške kod Križevaca, *Vjesnik Kr. hrvatsko-slavonsko-dalmatinskoga zemaljskoga arkiva*, 6, 1904, 242–265.
- Lővei 2009 – Pál Lővei, Az ország nagyjainak és előkelőinek 1402. évi oklevelén függő pecsétek, u / in: *Honoris causa: Tanulmányok Engel Pál tiszteletére*, eds. T. Neumann & G. Rácz, Budapest: MTA Történettudományi intézete, 2009.
- Lovrenović 2006 – Dubravko Lovrenović, *Na klizištu povijesti: Sveta kruna ugarska i Sveta kruna bosanska 1387-1463*, Zagreb – Sarajevo: Synopsis, 2006.
- Lukinović 1992 – Andrija Lukinović, *Povijesni spomenici zagrebačke biskupije*, sv. 5, Zagreb: Kršćanska sadašnjost, 1992.
- Matijević Sokol 2008 – Mirjana Matijević Sokol, Nostrum et regni nostri regnum. Srednjovjekovni arhiv Ugarsko-hrvatskog kraljevstva, *Arhivski vjesnik*, 51, 2008, 237–157.
- Mažuran 2002 – Ive Mažuran, *Povijesni izvori Slavonije, Baranje i Srijema 1390-1409*, Osijek: Državni arhiv u Osijeku, 2002.
- Miljan 2015 – Suzana Miljan, Plemstvo Zagrebačke županije prema kraljevskoj i banskoj vlasti u doba kralja Žigmunda (1387. – 1437.), u / in: *Prekretnice u suživotu Hrvata i Mađara. Ustanove, društvo, gospodarstvo i kultura. A horvát–magyar együttélés fordulópontjai. Intézmények, társadalom, gazdaság, kultúra*, eds. P. Fodor, D. Šokčević, J. Turkalj & D. Karbić, Budapest – Zagreb: MTA Bölcsészettudományi Kutatóközpont Történettudományi Intézet, Hrvatski institut za povijest, 2015, 195–202.
- Nekić 2017 – Antun Nekić, Plemički rod Tetenj od 13. do sredine 15. stoljeća, doktorska disertacija (rukopis) / Ph.D. dissertation (manuscript), Sveučilište u Zadru / University of Zadar, Zadar, 2017.
- Pálosfalvi 2004 – Tamás Pálosfalvi, Slavonski banovi u 15. stoljeću, u / in: *Hrvatsko-mađarski odnosi: zbornik radova*, eds.: M. Kruhek et al., Zagreb: Hrvatski institut za povijest, 2004, 45–50.
- Pálosfalvi 2006 – Tamás Pálosfalvi, Barbara und die Grafen von Cilli, u / in: *Sigismundus Rex et Imperator: Kunst und Kultur zur Zeit Sigismunds von Luxemburg 1387 – 1437*, eds. I. Takács, S. Papp, G. Poszler & S. Jékely, Budapest: Szépművészeti Múzeum, 2006, 295–297.
- Pálosfalvi 2014 – Tamás Pálosfalvi, *The Noble Elite in the County of Kőrös (Križevci) 1400-1526*, Budapest: MTA Bölcsészettudományi Kutatóközpont, 2014.
- Rady 2000 – Martyn Rady, *Nobility, Land and Service in Medieval Hungary*, New York: Palgrave, 2000.
- Rokai 1983 – Petar Rokai, Istorija porodice Maroti, doktorska disertacija (rukopis) Ph. D. dissertation (manuscript), Filozofski fakultet / Faculty of Philosophy, Beograd, 1983.
- Szende 2004 – Katalin Szende, The Uses of Archives in Medieval Hungary, u / in: *The Development of Literate Mentalities in East Central Europe*, eds. A. Adamsk & M. Mostert, Turnhout: Brepols, 2004, 107–142.
- Szende 2018 – Katalin Szende, *Trust, Authority, and the written word in the royal towns of medieval Hungary*, Turnhout: Brepols, 2018.
- Šišić 1902 – Ferdo Šišić, *Vojvoda Hrvoje Vukčić Hrvatinić i njegovo doba (1350.-1416.)*, Zagreb: Matica Hrvatska, 1902.
- Šišić 1904 – Ferdo Šišić, Ljetopis Pavla Pavlovića patricija zadarskog, *Vjesnik Kr. hrvatsko-slavonsko-dalmatinskoga zemaljskoga arkiva*, 6, 1904, 1–59.
- Šišić 1938 – Ferdo Šišić, Nekoliko isprava iz početka XV stoljeća, *Starine*, 39, 1938, 130–320.
- Tóth 2010 – Norbert Tóth, Rozgonyi Simon országbírósa (1409-1414), u / in: *“Fons, skepsis, lex”: ünnepi tanulmányok a 70 esztendő Makk Ferenc tiszteletére*, eds. T. Almási, É. Révész & G. Szabados, Szeged: SZTE Történeti Segédtudományok Tanszék, Szegedi Középkorász Műhely, 2010, 49–74.
- Tóth 2019 – Norbert Tóth, Tolvajok és rablók 1393-ban Szabolcs megyében, *Történelmi Szemle*, 61/1, Budapest, 2019, 149–164.
- Tringli 1997 – István Tringli, Két szokásjogi norma a közgyűlések működéséről, *Történelmi szemle*, 3-4, Budapest, 1997, 387–400.
- ZsO – Elemér Mályusz et al., *Zsigmondkori oklevéltár*, I-XII, Budapest, 1951-2013.