

Jesu li postojale župe na području ivanovačkog belskog preceptorata 1334. godine?

Were there Parishes in the Territory of the Bela Preceptory of the Hospitallers in 1334?

Izvorni znanstveni rad
Srednjovjekovna arheologija

Original scientific paper
Medieval archaeology

JURAJ BELAJ
Institut za arheologiju
Ulica grada Vukovara 68
HR – 10000 Zagreb
juraj.belaj@iarh.hr

UDK/UDC 902.2(497.5 Ivanec)
262.2(497.5–37 Ivanec)“13”(093)

Primljeno/Received: 06. 04. 2007.

Prihvaćeno/Accepted: 10. 09. 2007.

Popis župa iz Statuta Zagrebačkog kaptola iz 1334. god., što ga je sastavio arhiđakon Ivan Gorički, neprocjenjiv je izvor za proučavanje prostora srednjovjekovne Zagrebačke biskupije. U radu se problematizira činjenica da se u njemu ne navodi niti jedna župa s područja ivanovačkog preceptorata sa sjedištem u Beli. Iznose se različita mišljenja o razlozima za to, prisutna u literaturi. Analizom povijesnih dokumenata, u kombinaciji s rezultatima arheoloških istraživanja u Ivanecu, uz slutnje koja pružaju i najnovija mitološka proučavanja, autor zaključuje da su župe na tom prostoru tada postojale - ali pod ivanovačkom jurisdikcijom - te iz njih Biskupija nije prikupljala „Petrov novčić“, pa stoga nisu bile obuhvaćene popisom Ivana Goričkog. A „okupacija“ o kojoj govori Ivan Gorički, na njih se nije odnosila.

Ključne riječi: Župe, popis župa, Ivan Gorički, Ivanec, Bela, belski preceptorat, ivanovci

The 1334 list of parishes from the Statute of the Kaptol of Zagreb composed by archdeacon Ivan Gorički is an invaluable source for the study of the territory of the mediaeval Zagreb diocese. This paper addresses the problem that the list does not mention a single parish from the territory of the Hospitallers' Preceptory with the seat in Bela. Various opinions present in the literature about the reasons for this are mentioned. Based on the analysis of historical documents, in combination with the results of archaeological excavations in Ivanec, and coupled with the ideas provided by the latest mythological research, the author concludes that the parishes existed at that time in that territory – but under the jurisdiction of the Hospitallers – and that the Diocese did not collect "Peter's Pence" from them, which is why they were not included in Ivan Gorički's list. And the "occupation" of which Ivan Gorički speaks did not relate to them.

Key words: Parishes, list of parishes, Ivan Gorički, Ivanec, Bela, Bela Preceptory, Hospitallers

Za proučavanje organizacije društva, gustoće naseljenosti i sl., na prostoru srednjovjekovne Zagrebačke biskupije od neprocjenjive je važnosti popis župa iz Statuta Zagrebačkog kaptola iz 1334. god., što ga je sastavio arhiđakon Ivan Gorički. No pritom se ne smije zaboraviti da je on bio sastavljen za Rim, za podavanja „Petrova novčića“. Dobar pregled povijesti bavljena ovim popisom donio je *laureat*, prof. dr. sc. Željko Tomičić.¹

Jedna od osobitosti popisa predstavlja činjenica kako se u njemu ne navodi niti jedna župa s područja ivanovačkog preceptorata sa sjedištem u Beli. Koji je mogao biti razlog nenavođenja župa? Ili možda još nisu niti bile osnovane? Ta i slična pitanja bit će problematizirana u ovom radu, proisteklu iz mojeg doktorata (Belaj J. 2005; u njemu se detalj-

An invaluable source for the study of the social organization, population density etc. in the territory of the mediaeval Zagreb diocese is the list of parishes from the 1344 Statute of the Kaptol of Zagreb, composed by archdeacon Ivan Gorički. However, one should not forget that the list was created for Rome, for the tribute of "Peter's Pence". A good survey of the history of research on that list was provided by the laureate, Prof. Željko Tomičić.¹

One of the particularities of the list is the fact that it does not mention a single parish from the territory of the Hospitallers' Preceptory with the seat in Bela. What may have been the reason to omit these parishes? Or perhaps they had not been established yet? This paper, derived from my doctoral thesis (Belaj J. 2005; it mentions in detail the sources I used), will address these and similar questions. It is once again my pleasure to thank the laureate for having woken in me the

1. Popis iz 1334. god. objavili su: Krčelić 1770/1994; Rački 1872; Tkalčić 1874; Buturac 1944; Buturac 1984 (prema Tomičić 1999, 41).

1. The 1334 list was published by: Krčelić 1770/1994; Rački 1872; Tkalčić 1874; Buturac 1944; Buturac 1984 (after Tomičić 1999, 41).

no navode izvori kojima sam se služio). Ponovno mogu sa zadovoljstvom zahvaliti laureatu što je u meni probudio interes za pitanje viteških redova u Hrvatskoj, kojima sam se bavio u okviru njegovih znanstvenih projekata kao i na činjenici da su upravo istraživanja Starog grada u Ivanju, koja je započeo 1998. god., a čije mi je vođenje kasnije prepušteno, probudila moje zanimanje za ovu regiju.

Povijesni izvori spominju ivanovce u ovome kraju od 1209. god.², kada se u opisu zapadne granice varaždinskih posjeda spominje da ona *tendit ad magnam viam per quam itur ad terram cruciferiorum*, tj. da „... ide velikom cestom koja vodi u zemlju križnika“ (CD III, 90). No koliko god da su izvori u kojima se Bela spominje u ivanovačko doba relativno česti, nisu nimalo iscrpni. Naprotiv, iz njih nećemo doznati ništa ni o opsegu preceptorata, niti o izgledu njihova sjedišta kao niti o drugim objektima koje su na svome velikom imanju posjedovali. Tako nemamo ni vijesti o bilo kakvim crkvama, pa niti župnima. Dakle, osnovno pitanje ovog rada glasi: jesu li župe u vrijeme nastanka spomenutog popisa na ovom području postojale ili ne? Još jednu činjenicu moramo imati pred očima kada razmišljamo o tom problemu: belski se preceptorat smjestio na tromeđi Varaždinskog, Zagorskog i Kalničkog arhiđakonata. Već se župe u Bednji (de Tracustian) i Kamenici te u Martinščini (de sub Ozturch), Juranščini (de Belch) i Zajezdi 1334. god. nalaze u Zagorskom arhiđakonatu. U Kalničkom arhiđakonatu su, primjerice, župe Hraščina i Mađarevo (*de Greben*), a u Varaždinskom u Sv. Iliji, Maruševcu i Donjoj Voći (Buturac 1984, 51, 88, 104), sve u susjedstvu Belskog preceptorata. Slična situacija uočljiva je u kraju istočno i jugoistočno od Pakraca, prema Požeškoj kotlini, gdje se čak i granice biskupija ne poklapaju s granicom ivanovačkih posjeda (Belaj, J. 2001, 130). No valja reći da takvi posjedi u pravilu nisu bili posve zaokruženi, nego se ivanovačka zemlja prožimala sa zemljama drugih feudalaca, crkvenih i svjetovnih, te s posjedima koji su pripadali neposredno kralju.

Pojedini autori smatraju da se razlog nenavođenja župa krije u slaboj naseljenosti ovog kraja. Na odnos rasporeda župnih crkava i gustoće stanovništva upozorava, primjerice, N. Budak (Budak 1994, 68-71). To bi tada značilo da su i okolica Biškupca i Beletinca te Lepoglave također bile gotovo nenaseljene. I N. Klaić smatra da su vazali ivanovaca iz Bele bili rijetki (Klaić N. 1976, 575). No istodobno na susjednim posjedima ne nedostaje župa. Teško je pretpostaviti kako se upravo belski posjed izdvajao svojom nenaseljenošću, osobito ako znamo da su ivanovci bili relativno blagi prema svojim podložnicima (Klaić N. 1976, 575). Također je teško zamisliti kako bi bez stanovništva belski veleposjed uopće mogao funkcionirati. Opće je mišljenje da su feudalni tvrđi gradovi bili središtima ne samo gospodarstva i uprave, već i duhovnog života odnosno župe (Kruhek 1994, 187).

2. Neću se osvrnuti na ispravu iz 1201. god. u kojoj se spominje Selo ivanovaca kraj Varaždina jer po mojem mišljenju ono nije pripadalo belskom već varaždinskom preceptoratu (Belaj J. 2001, 39-45).

interest for the topic of the knightly orders in Croatia, which I dealt with within his scientific projects, as well as for the fact that it was precisely the investigation of the Old Town in Ivanec, which he had started in 1998, and whose management he later gave over to me, that deepened my interest in this region.

The historical sources mention the Hospitallers in this area from 1209², when in the description of the western border of the Varaždin estates it is mentioned that it *tendit ad magnam viam per quam itur ad terram cruciferiorum*, i.e. that “... it goes down a large road that leads to the land of the crusaders” (CD III, 90). But even though the sources in which Bela is mentioned in the time of the Hospitallers are relatively frequent, they are not exhaustive in the least. On the contrary, they will not tell us a thing about the scope of the Preceptory or about the appearance of their seat or about the other structures that they possessed on their large estate. There is thus no information about churches of any kind, including the parish ones. Therefore, the basic question of this paper is: were there any churches in this area at the time of the creation of the mentioned list or not? We have to keep in mind yet another fact when thinking about this problem: the Bela Preceptory was situated at the triple border of the Varaždin, Zagorje and Kalnik Archdeaconries. Already the parishes in Bednja (de Tracustian) and Kamenica as well as in Martinščina (de sub Ozturch), Juranščina (de Belch) and Zajezda in 1334 are situated in the Zagorje Archdeaconry. For instance, the parishes of Hraščina and Mađarevo (*de Greben*) are in the Kalnik Archdeaconry, while those in Sv. Ilija, Maruševac and Donja Voća are in the Varaždin Archdeaconry (Buturac 1984, 51, 88, 104), all of them in the neighbourhood of the Bela Preceptory. A similar situation exists in the area east and southeast of Pakrac, towards the Požega Valley, where even diocesan borders do not correspond to the border of the Hospitallers' estates (Belaj J. 2001, 130). However, it should be mentioned that such estates were generally not fully rounded; rather, the Hospitallers' land merged with those of other feudal lords, ecclesiastic and secular, as well as with the estates that belonged directly to the king.

Certain authors think that the reason for omitting the parishes lies in the sparse population of this region. The correlation of the location of parish churches with population density is commented e.g. by N. Budak (Budak 1994, 68-71). This would then mean that the surroundings of Biškupec and Beletinec as well as Lepoglava were also almost uninhabited. N. Klaić also believes that there were few vassals of the Hospitallers from Bela (Klaić N. 1976, 575). However, at that same time there is no lack of parishes in the neighbouring estates. It is hard to conceive that it was precisely the Bela estate that stood out with its low population density, especially if we know that the Hospitallers were relatively lenient toward their subjects (Klaić N. 1976, 575). It is likewise difficult to imagine how the Bela estate would function without any population in the first place. The general opinion is that the feudal fortified towns were centres not only of the economy and administration but also of spiritual life, meaning a parish (Kruhek 1994, 187). In other words, the fortified towns reveal that this region was also populated. Otherwise there would be no Bela, Gradišće, Lepoglava...

It perhaps suffices to mention here that the document

2. I shall not consider the document from 1201 which mentions a Hospitallers' Village near Varaždin because in my opinion it did not belong to the Bela Preceptory but to the Varaždin one (Belaj J. 2001, 39-45).

Drugim riječima, tvrdi gradovi govore da je i u ovom kraju bilo stanovništva. U suprotnome ne bi bilo Bele, Gradišća, Lepoglave ...

Možda je dovoljno na ovom mjestu napomenuti kako se u ispravi kojom Ivanovci potvrđuju županu Bedi darovnicu za posjed Tužno iz 1336. god. (dvije godine nakon popisivanja župa) uz utvrđeni grad Belu spominju Ivanovačka braća i Jobagioni, kako u gradu Beli, tako i oni koji pripadaju tom gradu (Fejér CD VIII/4, 204). A i ostali posjedi ovog preceptorata koji su bili dani u zakup, zacijelo nisu bili pusti. Kada su, primjerice, Ivanovci godine 1374. darovali predij Jurketinec, zadržali su za sebe pravo suda radi paleža, prolijevanja krvi i nasilja, a „krivce trećeg prestupka“ trebao je suditi sam predijalac (CD XV, 59). Ne govori li i taj detalj da je i Jurketinec bio prilično nastanjen?

Dobar poznavatelj crkvene povijesti ovoga kraja A. Lukinović, pak, smatra da je tu sigurno bilo župa (Lukinović 1998, 14) i to upravo zbog dobre naseljenosti. Iako se u dokumentima javljaju kasno (Sv. Margareta pod Belom 1431. i Sv. Lovro pod Belom 1488., Sv. Ivan - Ivanec 1574.), on misli da je župa ovdje bilo već u 14., a možda i u 13. st.: *Nema tu spomena nijedne župe od Ivanca do Beletince, a to je prostor na kojem je postojalo barem dvadesetak naselja. Sasvim je isključeno da na tako velikom prostoru nije postojala nijedna župa* (Lukinović 1998, 14). Iako se ne može znati koliko je poštovan dekret Stjepana I. prema kojem deset sela može podići zajedničku crkvu (Budak 1994, 66), jer je jači princip nastanka župa bio u nas utjecaj velikaša i plemstva, ipak je plemstvo već prije počelo dizati crkve na svojim imanjima, pa i širom svojeg područja. Doista zvuči nevjerovatno da bi crkveni viteški red u tome zaostajao, kako ne bi imao zakonito organiziranu crkvenu službu, a to su i tada bile župe (Lukinović 1998, 14). Imajući u vidu do sada iznesene argumente, priklanam se Lukinovićevu mišljenju, osobito jer smatram da si viteški red Ivanovaca i zbog svojeg ugleda, ali prvenstveno jer je to koliko vojnički toliko i crkveni red, ne bi dopustio da tijekom već dužeg vremena (barem od početka 13. st.) na svojem posjedu nije organizirao vjerski život unutar župa.

Arheološka istraživanja koja u Ivancu traju od godine 1998. daju dodatnu težinu ovoj tezi. Naravno, arheološki se ne može potvrditi da je pronađena crkva bila župna ili da je groblje oko nje župno groblje. Ipak, ovdje prikazana analiza povijesnih dokumenata, u kombinaciji s rezultatima naših arheoloških istraživanja³ koje ću ovdje u kratkim crtama prikazati, te uz slutnje o nastanku slavenskog svetog prostora na mjestu današnjega Ivanca koja pružaju i najnovija mitološka proučavanja (Belaj V. 1998; 2006), daju jednu posve novu i već prilično zaokruženu sliku.

U dvorištu renesansnog kaštela otkriveni su, naime, temelji srednjovjekovne crkve Sv. Ivana Krstitelja. S ovom se crkvom relativno kasno susrećemo u povijesnim ispravama. Svakako je postojala i prije godine 1396., kada se

3. Najnoviji su rezultati sažeto prikazani u Belaj J. 2007.

from 1336 (two years after the parishes were listed) in which the Hospitallers grant to the župan (prefect) Beda the charter for the Tužno estate, the Brothers Hospitaller and urban serfs (iobagiones) are mentioned in addition to the fortified town of Bela, both those in the town as well as those who belong to that town (Fejér CD VIII/4, 204). Surely the remaining estates of that Preceptory that were leased were likewise not empty. When for instance the Hospitallers made a gift of the Jurketinec estate in 1374, they kept to themselves the judicial rights over arson, the shedding of blood and violence, while the "third-degree perpetrators" were to be judged by the landlord himself (CD XV, 59). Does this detail also not tell us that Jurketinec was quite populated?

A. Lukinović, an expert on the ecclesiastical history of this region believes that there certainly were parishes here (Lukinović 1998, 14), precisely owing to the dense population. Even though they appear relatively late in the documents (Sv. Margareta under Bela in 1431 and Sv. Lovro under Bela in 1488, Sv. Ivan - Ivanec in 1574), he believes that there were parishes here already by the 14th and perhaps even by the 13th century: *There is no mention here of a single parish between Ivanec and Beletinec, and this is an area where at least twenty or so settlements existed. It is entirely out of the question that not a single parish existed in such a large area* (Lukinović 1998, 14). Although we can not know to what extent the people followed the decree by Stephen I according to which ten villages can erect a joint church (Budak 1994, 66), as the influence of the landlords and nobility was a more important principle for the creation of parishes in our areas, it was still the nobles who even earlier started building churches on their estates and throughout their territory. It indeed sounds implausible that an ecclesiastical knightly order would lag behind and not have an *officially organized ecclesiastical service, which then also meant a parish* (Lukinović 1998, 14). With regard to the arguments put forward so far I subscribe to Lukinović's opinion, particularly as I believe that the knightly order of the Hospitallers, on account of their reputation but primarily because they were a military order as much as a religious one, would not permit a substantial period of time to pass (at least from the beginning of the 13th century) before they organized religious life on their estate within parishes.

The archaeological excavations that have been carried out in Ivanec since 1998 add additional weight to this thesis. Naturally, it can not be proven archaeologically that the discovered church was parochial or that the cemetery surrounding it was parochial. Nevertheless, the analysis of historical documents that is presented here, together with the results of our archaeological excavations³, which I will summarize here, in addition to the ideas about the creation of the Slavic holy space on the site of the present-day Ivanec, provided also by the latest mythological research (Belaj V. 1998; 2006), give an entirely new and already quite well-rounded picture.

The foundations of a mediaeval church of St. John the Baptist were discovered in the courtyard of the Renaissance castle. We encounter this church relatively late in historical documents. It certainly existed prior to 1396 when Ivanec was mentioned in the document by Ivan ml. (John jr.) of Paližna for the first time (Dobronić 1984a, 23; Hrg 1975). This is above all revealed by the name of the settlement - "free municipality

3. The latest results were briefly presented in Belaj J. 2007.

Ivanec prvi put spominje u ispravi Ivana ml. od Paližne (Do-bronić 1984a, 23; Hrg 1975). To nam prije sveg govori ime naselja „slobodna općina Svetoga Ivana“ (*libera villa Sancti Iohannis*). Prvi ju put u dokumentima susrećemo označenu kao župnu tek 1574. god. Tad se, naime, spominje župa Sv. Ivan u Ivanu (Budak 1994, 69). Te je godine, prema E. Laszowskom, Benko Petev posvojio crkvu Sv. Ivana u Ivanu, koja je spadala Ladislavu (Laszowski 1903/1904, 9). Kasnije se gradi nova, današnja župna crkva Sv. Marije Magdalene, a crkva Sv. Ivana postaje vjerojatno dvorska kapela u sklopu kaštela Petheövac. To se moralo dogoditi između 1574. i 1628. god. (Belaj J. 2005, 125).

Još uvijek nije moguće precizno datirati vrijeme izgradnje crkve Sv. Ivana Krstitelja. Većina nalaza obrađenoga kamenja, pronađenih u urušenjima, ukazuje na gotički karakter njezine posljednje faze (primjerice, nadvoji gotičkih prozora te potprozornik, ulomak trijumfalnog luka, ulomak rebra svoda, ulomak kipa – ruke sklopljene u molitvu i dr.). Ulomak baze (ili kapitela) stupa iz doba romanike, pronađen kao spolija u temeljima broda, sugerira pak postojanje i nekog romaničkog objekta u blizini. No zanimljivi su neki drugi pokretni nalazi, osobito oni pronađeni u svetištu crkve. Prvenstveno je to pfenig iskovan u Beču za Alberta II. (1330.-1358.). Koliko god je sam datum kovanja nepouzdan pokazatelj starosti sloja u kojem je novac pronađen (a ovaj je pronađen u spremištanu sloju), ipak je znakovito kako je ovaj primjerak - kovan otprilike u vrijeme popisivanja župa – pronađen u samom svetištu župne crkve Sv. Ivana Krstitelja.

Zanimljive rezultate je dala i izmjera veličine crkve, odnosno njezina broda. Površina mu je oko 65,3 m². U srednjoj Europi su seoske crkve još u 11. st. imale oko 35 m², a u 13. st., zahvaljujući znatnom porastu broja stanovnika kao posljedice kolonizacije, crkve imaju oko 65 m² (Budak 1994, 156), što gotovo na vlas odgovara situaciji u Ivanu. Napominjem da je riječ o brodu. Svetište djeluje starije. Prema gotičkom pravilu da širina zida svoda svetišta iznosi 1/10 njegova raspona, u Ivanu bismo očekivali zidove debljine oko 50 cm, a iznose 120 cm. Stoga možemo pomišljati kako je svetište znatno starije i da je imalo ujedno i obrambenu ulogu.

U pojedinim grobovima u svetištu pronađene su karičice sa S-petljom. Možemo pretpostaviti kako su ukopani prije sredine 13. st., točnije, prije mongolske provale.⁴ Pokopavanje u svetištu je, dakle, vjerojatno započelo i prije pretpostavljenog dolaska ivanovaca! Još nije otkriven niti jedan grob presječen zidovima svetišta, što ipak ne znači da možda nema i takvih, u nižim slojevima. No još stariji je kulturni sloj čije nam istraživanje tek predstoji, a kojega su presjekli spomenuti grobovi, a čini se i zidovi svetišta. Posebnu pozornost privlače fragmenti keramike ukrašeni valovnicom koji su prikupljeni na kontaktima toga sloja

4. Ipak, moramo biti oprezni kod datiranja grobova pomoću ovakvog nakita koji je i inače dugotrajan, a često se mogao, kao miraz, prenositi s koljena na koljeno prije nego bi ga netko ponio u grob (usmeno upozorenje Ž. Tomičića).

of Saint John“ (*libera villa Sancti Iohannis*). We find it marked in the documents as a parish church for the first time as late as 1574 – the date when *the parish of St. John in Ivanec* is mentioned (Budak 1994, 69). According to E. Laszowski, in that year Benko Petev adopted the church of St. John in Ivanec, which belonged to Ladislav (Laszowski 1903/1904, 9). The new, present-day parish church of St. Mary Magdalene was built later, and the church of St. John probably became a court chapel within the castle of the Petheö family. This must have taken place between 1574 and 1628 (Belaj J. 2005, 125).

It is still impossible to precisely date the building of the church of St. John the Baptist. Most of the finds of worked stone, found among the debris, point to the Gothic character of its latest phase (e.g., the lintels of Gothic windows and a windowsill, a segment of a triumphal arch, a fragment of a vault rib, a fragment of a statue – hands folded in prayer etc.). A fragment of a base (or a capital) of a column from the Romanesque period, discovered as a spolium in the foundation of the nave, points to the existence also of a Romanesque building nearby. Other movable finds are also interesting, particularly those discovered in the church sanctuary. This primarily applies to a pfennig minted in Vienna during Albert II's rule (1330-1358). Even though the date of minting is an unreliable indicator of the age of the layer in which the coin was found (and it was found in a mixed layer), it is still indicative that this piece – minted approximately at the time when the list of parishes was compiled – was found in the very sanctuary of the parish church of St. John the Baptist.

The measurement of the church, more precisely its nave, also produced interesting results. Its surface covers approximately 65,3 m². The village churches in central Europe already in the 11th century covered around 35 m², and in the 13th century, owing to a substantial increase in population as the result of colonization, the churches are around 65 m², which almost perfectly corresponds to the situation in Ivanec. I emphasize that this applies to the nave. The sanctuary appears older. According to the Gothic rule that the width of the walls of the vaulted sanctuary amounts to 1/10 of its span, we would expect to find in Ivanec walls approximately 50 cm thick, while they are in fact 120 cm thick. We can therefore assume that the sanctuary is much older and that it also fulfilled a defensive role.

S-loop rings were found in several graves in the sanctuary. We can assume that they were buried prior to the mid-13th cent., more precisely before the Mongol invasion.⁴ Burials in the sanctuary therefore probably started even before the presumed arrival of the Hospitallers! Not a single grave cut by the sanctuary walls has been discovered so far, which still does not necessarily mean that there are none, in lower layers. However, a layer that we have yet to start excavating, and which was cut by the mentioned graves and it appears also by the walls of the sanctuary, is even older. Particularly interesting are the fragments of pottery with a waveline decoration, collected at the point of contact of that layer with other stratigraphic units. This pottery is very fragmented and barely reveals the shapes of vessels. Rare pieces with a preserved rim, as well as the texture of the pottery, in addition to the manner in which it was decorated with the wavelines, cautiously indicate that it was

4. Nevertheless, we have to be careful when dating graves by means of such jewellery, which is long-lasting to start with, and could often be transferred as dowry through generations until someone takes it to the grave (personal suggestion by Ž. Tomičić).

s drugim stratigrafskim jedinicama. Vrlo je fragmentirana i jedva da govori o oblicima posuda. Rijetki primjerci s očuvanim obodom, kao i faktura keramike te način na koji je ukrašena valovnicama, oprezno nas upućuju da je izrađena vjerojatno u 9. ili 10. st. Možemo čak zamisliti kako je spomenuti kulturni sloj nastao u vrijeme oblikovanja svetog, još poganskog krajobraza na području za koje se smije pretpostaviti da je tvorilo prostor jedne od prvobitnih slavenskih župa u dolini Bednje (Belaj V. 2006), te da je u središtu ove slavenske župe vremenom nastalo i sjedište crkvene župe ovog kraja. Sve brojniji rimski (ulomci tegula i opeka te osobito ulomak nadgrobnog žrtvenika⁵), latenski i kasnobrončanodobni nalazi (keramika) upućuju na znatno dulji kontinuitet nastanjivanja ovog položaja – koji i danas dominira u prosjeku za oko dva metra nad okolicom – od pretpostavljenog u početku naših istraživanja.

Ukoliko na temelju ovih indicija pretpostavimo da je župa bilo, preostaje dokučiti razlog njihova nenavođenja. I tu su, uglavnom, najzastupljenija dva mišljenja: da su župe, kao i granice, okupirali „Nijemci“ ili su ih pak „okupirali“ ivanovci koji su, navodno, bili u sukobu sa zagrebačkim biskupom. Naime, sastavljač popisa napominje da je razlog nenavođenja pojedinih župa Varaždinskog arhiđakonata „okupacija granica“: *Ostale crkve koje postoje u granicama kraljevina Ugarske ovdje nisu pisane, jer kako su same granice, tako su i crkve okupirane, iako u ovom arhiđakonatu postoje* (Lukinović 1998, 13).

Za rješavanje našeg problema bit će važna istodobna situacija u Beloj krajini. Nju je, naime, hrvatsko-ugarsko kraljevstvo izgubilo vjerojatno početkom 13. st., kako je to argumentirano pokazao M. Kosi (1995, 19-25). Uskoro nakon tog zagrebačka je biskupija očito izgubila svoje župe u Beloj krajini. O tom govori dokument iz 1228. god. kojim je akvilejski patrijarh Bertold Andeški oblikovao akvilejsku crkvenu upravu u Beloj krajini. U Črnomlju je posvetio župnu crkvu Sv. Petra s četiri podružnice. U to vrijeme očito više ne možemo govoriti o Beloj krajini kao dijelu zagrebačke biskupije. Kancelarija Zagrebačke biskupije to stanje nije dugo htjela priznati, pa onodobni hrvatski dokumenti stvaraju privid da je Bela krajina još uvijek u njezinu sastavu. Tako se u spomenutu popisu iz 1334. nabrajaju župe u Metlici, Podzemlju, Črnomlju, Semiču i Vinici.

Dok je za župe u graničnom području oko Metlike očito još tinjala nada da bi mogle biti vraćene pod jurisdikciju Zagrebačke biskupije, pa ih Ivan Gorički navodi u svojem popisu, na granici Varaždinskog arhiđakonata je situacija drukčija. Čini se kako se ovdje radilo o župama koje su prilično davno pripadale Zagrebačkoj biskupiji, ali više nitko nema iluzija da bi mogle biti vraćene. Riječ je, očito, o župama u Halozama te o župama sjeverno od Drave i istočno od Ptuj, a ne o župama na području ivanovačkog belskog preceptorata. Jedna je župa ipak još preostala: u popisu se, naime, navodi i župa u Borlu (danas u Mariborskoj biskupi-

5. O njemu opširnije u Belaj J. 2007.

produced probably in the 9th or 10th century. We can even imagine that the mentioned cultural layer was formed during a time when the holy, at the time still pagan landscape was taking shape, in the area for which it can be presumed that it formed part of one of the primary Slavic parishes in the valley of the Bednja river (Belaj V. 2006), and that in time also the seat of the ecclesiastical parish of this region was created in the centre of this Slavic parish. The increasingly numerous Roman (fragments of tegulae and bricks and particularly a fragment of a tomb altar⁵), La Tène and Late Bronze Age finds (pottery) point to a considerably longer continuity of settlement on this site – which is still today dominant by virtue of its partition which is on average 2 metres higher than the surrounding terrain – from the one presumed at the beginning of our excavations.

If we assume based on these indications that parishes indeed existed, we still have to grasp the reasons why they were not mentioned. Here also, for the most part, two opinions predominate: that the parishes, same as the borders, were occupied by “the Germans” or that they were “occupied” by the Hospitaliers, who were supposedly in confrontation with the bishop of Zagreb. The compiler of the list explicitly states that the reason for the omission of certain parishes of the Varaždin archdeaconry lay in the “occupation of the borders”: *The remaining churches that exist within the borders of the Kingdom of Hungary are not listed here, because just as the borders themselves, so were the churches occupied, even though they are present in this archdeaconry* (Lukinović 1998, 13).

The contemporary situation in Bela Krajina will be important for the solution of our problem. The Kingdom of Croatia and Hungary lost it probably at the beginning of the 13th century, as has been demonstrated with good arguments by M. Kosi (1995, 19-25). The Zagreb diocese apparently lost its parishes in Bela Krajina soon after that. This can be seen from a document from 1228, by which Bertold of Andechs, the patriarch of Aquileia, formed the Aquileian ecclesiastical administration in Bela Krajina. In Črnomelj he dedicated the parish church of St. Peter with four branches. At that time we can obviously no longer speak of Bela Krajina as part of the Zagreb diocese. The chancery of the Zagreb diocese long declined from recognizing that situation and the contemporary Croatian documents create the impression that Bela Krajina continued to be under its authority. Thus the mentioned list from 1334 mentions the parishes in Metlika, Podzemelj, Črnomelj, Semič and Vinica.

While there was still hope that the parishes in the border area around Metlika might still be returned under the jurisdiction of the Zagreb diocese, which is why Ivan Gorički mentions them in his list, on the border of the Varaždin archdeaconry the situation is different. It seems that these parishes belonged to the Zagreb diocese long ago, but that nobody has any illusions any longer that they would be returned. The parishes in question are obviously those in Haloze and those north of the Drava and south of Ptuj, and not those in the territory of the Bela Preceptory of the Hospitaliers. One parish still remained: the list mentions a parish in Borl (presently in the Maribor diocese). B. Krčelić also thought that the “occupied” parishes were those *that are presently in Styria* (Krčelić 1770/1994, 40). Still, this also tells us nothing about why these parishes are not

5. More extensively about this in Belaj J. 2007.

ji). B. Krčelić također je smatrao da su „osvojene“ župe one koje se danas nalaze u Štajerskoj (Krčelić 1770/1994, 40). Ipak, niti to ništa ne govori o tome zašto nisu te župe na ivanovačkom belskom području.

Zbunjuje popis iz godine 1501., kada je „privremena okupacija“ već zacijelo prestala. U tom se popisu kao nove navode župe u Biškupcu, Biškupečkoj Poljani i Beletincu te neubicirana župa Svih svetih in *Korusa*. Ali ni u tom popisu nema župa s ovih ivanovačkih posjeda, pa ni onih za koje pouzdano znamo da su postojale: u Margečanu 1431., u Lovrečanu 1488. A. Lukinović nagađa da su možda ivanovci iz Bele bili u sukobu sa zagrebačkim biskupom (Lukinović 1998, 14), pa župe koje su oni nadzirali nisu uvrštene u popis biskupijskih župa. Ali neke druge ivanovačke crkve navode se kao župne (u Gori, Farkašiću i Prozorju, možda i u Novoj Rači; Belaj J. 2001), a teško je zamisliti tešku svađu ivanovaca s biskupom koja se ne bi odrazila na cijeli red, već bi bila ograničena samo na neke preceptorate.

Postoji još jedan mogući razlog za nefunkcioniranje župa, no mislim, ne i za njihovo nenavođenje: nesređenost prilika. Iako nije na samoj granici, belski je preceptorat, kao i čitavo Zagorje, vrlo blizu granice s „Teutonijom“ i izložen upadima njemačkih postrojba. Stoga nije čudno da su još Arpadovići ubrajali Zagorje u *confinium*, tj. u krajinu prema Teutoniji (Klaić N. 1976, 323). Izgleda da su zbog ovakva strateškog smještaja u blizini granice ivanovci (i prije njih možda i templari) na ovom području bili neposredno u službi ugarsko-hrvatskog kralja, te da im je vjerojatno osnovna uloga bila čuvanje zapadne granice kraljevstva. Sličnu situaciju imamo i u Velikoj Nedelji istočno od Ptuja i u Beloj krajini, gdje su postojale tvrđave Njemačkog viteškoga reda. Uloga „naših“ viteških redova je samo naličje situacije s druge, njemačke strane granice, gdje su i u Podravlju i u Pokuplju bili angažirani teutonci – njemački viteški red, s tom razlikom što oni nisu branili državni teritorij, nego su ga trebali proširiti, odnosno očuvati osvojeno (Belaj J. 2001, 245).

Početak 14. st. umiješali su se u dinastičke borbe i ivanovci i njemačke čete, pa je stradao i grad Bela. Nikola, sin Petra Ludbreškog, preotero ga je i vratio ivanovcima (Kukuljević 1886, 48). I u nekim dokumentima koji se odnose na belske posjede ima spomena ovih ratnih zbivanja. Ivan „Dijete“ dobio je posjed Tužno 1306. god. (Fejér CD VIII/1, 202) zbog svojih zasluga u obrani Bele. Kada je trideset godina kasnije taj posjed potvrđen njegovom sinu, županu Bedi, u listini se spominje i rat koji se vodi protiv Nijemaca (Fejér CD VIII/4, 204; CD X, 285). Iz ovog slijedi da je godine 1336. (dvije godine nakon popisa župa) rat još trajao.

No u popisu su navedene, primjerice, župe u Vrbovečkom arhiđakonatu, u Borlu i čitavom kraju sjeverozapadno od belskog preceptorata, pa neprijateljstva oko granice nisu mogla biti razlogom da se župe ne navedu. Možda bismo mogli nagađati i o kombinaciji više razloga za nenavođenje župa ivanovačkog belskog preceptorata, kada ne bi postojao još jedan na koji, čini se, nitko do sada nije obratio dovoljnu pozornost. Riječ je o činjenici da organizacijska

in the territory of the Hospitallers of Bela.

The list from 1501, when the “temporary occupation” had certainly ceased, is confusing. This list mentions as the new parishes those in Biškupec, Biškupečka Poljana and Beletinec, as well as the parish of All Saints in *Korusa*, whose exact position is unknown. But there are no parishes from these Hospitaller estates in this list either, not even those for which we know for certain that they existed: in Margečan in 1431, in Lovrečan in 1488. A. Lukinović guesses that perhaps the Hospitallers from Bela were in conflict with the bishop of Zagreb (Lukinović 1998, 14), so the parishes under their control were not included in the list of the diocesan parishes. However, some other Hospitaller churches are described as parochial (in Gora, Farkašić and Prozorje and perhaps in Nova Rača as well; Belaj J. 2001), and it is hard to conceive of a major clash of the Hospitallers with the bishop that would not have reflected on the entire order but would stay limited instead to only a couple of preceptories.

There is another possible reason for the parishes not functioning, but in my opinion, not for their omission from the list: a general lack of order. Although not lying exactly on the border, the Bela Preceptory, just as the entire Zagorje region, lies close to the border with “Teutonia” and it is exposed to incursions by German units. It is therefore not surprising that already the Arpads included Zagorje into *confinium*, i.e. the military border to Teutonia (Klaić N. 1976, 323). It appears that owing to their strategic position near the border the Hospitallers (and before them perhaps also the Templars) in this area were directly in the service of the Hungarian-Croatian king, and that their basic role was probably to defend the western border of the kingdom. We have a similar situation also in Velika Nedelja east of Ptuj and in Bela Krajina, where fortresses of the German knightly order existed. The role of “our” knightly orders is only the other side of the coin with regard to the situation on the other, German side of the border, where both in Podravlje and in Pokuplje the Teutons – a German knightly order – were engaged, with the difference that they were not defending the national territory, but were intended to enlarge it and to preserve what was occupied (Belaj J. 2001, 245).

At the beginning of the 14th century both the Hospitallers and the German units joined the dynastic struggles, in which the town of Bela sustained damage. Nikola, the son of Petar Ludbreški (Peter of Ludbreg), recaptured it and returned it to the Hospitallers (Kukuljević 1886, 48). These war events are mentioned also in certain documents that relate to the Bela estates. Ivan “Dijete” (John “the Child”) received the Tužno estate in 1306 (Fejér CD VIII/1, 202) on account of his merits in the defense of Bela. When thirty years later that estate was again confirmed to župan Beda, his son, the charter mentioned also the war that was waged against the Germans (Fejér CD VIII/4, 204; CD X, 285). From this it follows that in 1336 (two years after the list of parishes was compiled) the war was still going on.

However, the list mentions the parishes in the Vrbovec archdeaconry, in Borl and in the entire area northwest of the Bela Preceptory, so the hostilities around the border could not have been the reason for the omission of the parishes. We might make guesses also about a combination of several reasons for the omission of the parishes of the Bela Preceptory of the Hospitallers, if there were not another one to which nobody has paid sufficient attention so far. Namely, the organizational structure of the Hospitallers stands apart from the

struktura ivanovaca istupa iz okvira teritorijalne crkvene organizacije, a također i iz okvira svjetovne feudalne moći, što je ujedno i razlog da je o viteškim redovima očuvano relativno malo pisanih izvora (Ruttikay 1993, 147-148). To se lijepo vidi na primjeru ivanovačkog velikog posjeda u Pakracu i okolici (Belaj J. 2001, 127-138).

Tamo u popisu također nema župa. J. Buturac to ovako tumači: *Župa Pakrac se u srednjovjekovnim dokumentima ne spominje jer je Pakrac bio centar i gospoštija vranskog priorata, u vlasti viteškog reda ivanovaca i zato je izuzet od vlasti zagrebačkog biskupa* (Buturac 1984, 59). U popisu župa Zagrebačke biskupije iz 1501. god. naknadno je na omotu zapisano: *Nota plebanos in prioratu (...) in Lesnycze, in Razosa et in Pekracz* (Szabo 1909). Dakle, župe ovog područja ne potpadaju pod biskupiju, već pod ivanovačku upravu i spominju se *kao župe prioratske*, odnosno, ivanovački su posjedi bili upravno odijeljeni od Zagrebačke biskupije (Szabo 1911, 17). *To potvrđuju porezni popisi iz 1495. i kasnije te prema njima Ljesnica, Račeša, Pakrac, Starča i Trnava pripadaju „ad Prioratum“* (Dobronić 1984a, 59). Štoviše, kralj Bela IV. naglašava da je Pakrac izuzet iz Požeške županije (CD IV, 48, 44). No to nipošto nije značilo da su vitezovi bili posve samostalni: godine 1347. ivanovci su, nakon desetogodišnjeg neplaćanja desetine pečuškom biskupu, pregovarali o plaćanju desetine *za posjede i utvrđene gradove u distriktu Pakraca (Puchruch)* (Fejér CD IX/1, 515, 285). Slično je bilo i na području Zagrebačke biskupije (Dobronić 1984, 112-115).

Primijenjeno na Belski preceptorat, to bi značilo da su i tu mogle postojati i djelovati župe pod ivanovačkom jurisdikcijom, župe iz kojih Biskupija nije prikupljala „Petrov novčić“, pa stoga nisu bile obuhvaćene popisom Ivana Goričkoga. A „okupacija“ o kojoj govori Ivan Gorički, na njih se uopće nije odnosila. Time i pitanje, kojem je arhiđakonatu pripadao belski preceptorat, gubi svoj smisao. Župe koje nisu bile biskupijske, nisu bile uključene u neki od biskupijskih arhiđakonata.

framework of the territorial ecclesiastical organization, but also from that of the secular feudal authority, which is at the same time the reason that relatively few written sources have been preserved about the knightly orders (Ruttikay 1993, 147-148). This is nicely seen in the example of the large estate of the Hospitallers in Pakrac and its surroundings (Belaj J. 2001, 127-138).

In that list there are no parishes either. J. Buturac explains it in this way: the parish of Pakrac is *not mentioned in medieval documents because Pakrac was the seat and estate of the Vrana Priory, in the possession of the knightly order of the Hospitallers, and this is why it was exempted from the authority of the bishop of Zagreb* (Buturac 1984, 59). On the cover of the list of the parishes of the Zagreb diocese from 1501 somebody later inscribed: *Nota plebanos in prioratu (...) in Lesnycze, in Razosa et in Pekracz* (Szabo 1909). Therefore, the parishes of this area are not governed by the diocese but by the Hospitallers, and they are referred to as the parishes of the Priory, that is, the Hospitallers' estates were administratively separated from the Zagreb diocese (Szabo 1911, 17). *This is corroborated by the tax lists from 1495 and later, and according to them Ljesnica, Račeša, Pakrac, Starča and Trnava belong „ad Prioratum“* (Dobronić 1984a, 59). Moreover, king Bela IV specifically mentions that Pakrac was removed from the Požega county (CD IV, 48, 44). However, that in no way meant that the knights were fully independent: in 1347 the Hospitallers, after a ten-year-long intermission in payment of the tithe to the bishop of Pecs, negotiated about the payment of the tithe for *the estates and fortified towns in the district of Pakrac (Puchruch)* (Fejér CD IX/1, 515, 285). The case was similar in the territory of the Zagreb diocese (Dobronić 1984, 112-115).

If we apply this to the Bela Preceptory, this would mean that also here parishes may have existed and acted under the jurisdiction of the Hospitallers, parishes from which the Diocese was not collecting „Peter's Pence“, which is why they were not included in Ivan Gorički's list. And the „occupation“ that Ivan Gorički speaks of did not relate to them in any way at all. With this the question of which archdeaconry the Bela Preceptory belonged to loses meaning. The non-diocesan parishes were not included in any of the diocesan archdeaconries.

LITERATURA / BIBLIOGRAPHY :

- Belaj J., 2001, Arheološko naslijeđe viteških redova na sjeverozapadnom prostoru središnje Hrvatske, magistarski rad, Sveučilište u Zagrebu
- Belaj J., 2005, Arheološka provjera nazočnosti templara i ivanovaca oko Ivanšćice, doktorska disertacija, Sveučilište u Zagrebu
- Belaj J., 2005a, Arheološka istraživanja lokaliteta "Stari grad" u Ivancu, AIA I/2005, Zagreb, 61-66.
- Belaj J., 2005b, Ivanec - Stari grad, HAG 1/2004, Zagreb, 88-90.
- Belaj J., 2007, Arheološka istraživanja u Ivancu na lokalitetu Stari grad, 100 godina Arheološkog muzeja Istre u Puli - nova istraživanja u Hrvatskoj, IzdanjaHAD, Pula (u tisku)
- Belaj V., 1998, Drugi pogled na podrijetlo imena grada Ivanca, Radovi Hrvatskog društva folklorista VII, Zagreb, 29-39.
- Belaj V., 2006, Mit u prostoru, Mošćenički zbornik 3, Mošćenice, 5-39.
- Budak N., 1994, *Gradovi Varaždinske županije u srednjem vijeku*, Zagreb-Koprivnica
- Buturac J., 1944, Popis župa Zagrebačke biskupije od godine 1334., Zbornik Zagrebačke biskupije 1094.-1944., Zagreb, 409-454.
- Buturac J., 1984, Popis župa zagrebačke biskupije 1334. i 1501. godine, StarineJAZU LIX, Zagreb, 43-108.
- Dobronić L., 1984, *Viteški redovi - Templari i ivanovci u Hrvatskoj*, Zagreb
- Dobronić L., 1984a, *Posjedi i sjedišta templara, ivanovaca i sepulkralaca u Hrvatskoj*, RadJAZU, knjiga 406, Razred za likovne umjetnosti, knjiga XI, Zagreb
- Fejér G., 1829-1844, *Codex diplomaticus Hungariae ecclesiasticus ac civilis*, Budae
- Hrg M., 1975, Ivanec prvi put u povijesnom dokumentu od 22. lipnja 1396. godine, Ivanečki kalendar 75, Varaždin, 128-130.
- Klaić N., 1976, *Povijest Hrvata u razvijenom srednjem vijeku*, Školska knjiga, Zagreb
- Kosi, M., 1995, *Templarji na Slovenskem. Prispevek k reševanju nekaterih vprašanj srednjeveške zgodovine Prekmurja, Bele krajine in Ljubljane*, Zveza zgodovinskih društev Slovenije, Ljubljana
- Krčelić B., 1770/1994, *Historiarum chatedralis ecclesiae Zagrebiensis*, Partis 1, Tom 1, Zagreb, reprint; 1994: Povijest stolne crkve zagrebačke, Institut za suvremenu povijest, Zagreb
- Kruhek M., 1994, Fortifikacijsko graditeljstvo i obrana hrvatskih zemalja tijekom stoljeća, *Gazophylacium* 3-4, Zagreb, 173-194.
- Kukuljević Sakcinski I., 1886, *Priorat vranski sa vitezi templari i hospitalci sv. Ivana u Hrvatskoj*, RadJAZU, knjiga LXXXI, Razredi filologičko-historički i filozofičko-juridički, knjiga XIV, Zagreb, 1-80.
- Laszowski E., 1903/1904, Povijesne crtice o gradu Beli u županiji varaždinskoj, VHADns VII/2, Zagreb, 1-12.
- Lukinović A. 1998, *Župa Margečan*, Margečan
- Rački F., 1872, Popis župa Zagrebačke biskupije 1334. i 1501. godine, StarineJAZU IV, Zagreb, 201-229.
- Ruttkay A., 1993, Die Ritter- und Spitalsorden in der Slowakei (Archäologie und Geschichte), u: *Actes du XII^e Congrès International des Sciences Préhistoriques et Protohistoriques*, 1.-7. Septembre 1991, Bratislava, 146-161.
- Smičiklas T., 1904-1976, *Codex diplomaticus Regni Croatiae, Dalmatiae et Slavoniae*, Zagreb
- Szabo Gj., 1909, Lijesnica, VHADns X, Zagreb, 40-46.
- Szabo Gj., 1911, Prilozi za povijesnu topografiju požeške županije, VHADns XI, Zagreb, 1-21.
- Tkalčić I., 1874, *Monumenta historica episcopatus Zagradiensis II.*, Zagreb
- Tomičić Ž., 1999, Ranosrednjovjekovno groblje u Sv. Jurju u Trnju u Međimurju – prinos datiranja nalazišta, PrillnstArheolZagrebu 15-16/1998-1999, Zagreb, 41-60.