

UDK 316.343.3 (497.5)"12"(093)  
929 Toma arhidakon  
949.75"12"(093)  
Izvorni znanstveni rad  
Primljeno: 22. 7. 2002.

## Image of Royal Authority in the Work of Thomas Archdeacon

Mladen Ančić

Zavod za povijesne znanosti HAZU u Zadru, Zadar, Republika Hrvatska  
Hrvatski studiji Sveučilišta u Zagrebu, Zagreb, Republika Hrvatska

On the basis of modern interpretative concepts and schemes the author considers the background of stories rendered by a Split chronicler from the 13<sup>th</sup> century, Thomas Archdeacon. From the description of the "images"– of the wider social scene, the author focuses on the "image" of the king and his rule. Breaking down this "image", the author points to various elements of which it consists, trying in his conclusion to discern to which extent Thomas's narration reflects realities of the time in which the chronicler lived and worked.

In a huge historiography dealing with the *Chronicle* of Thomas Archdeacon, which breaks down the materials and his personal memories, those that the Split chronicler so skilfully put together in one of the more important European chronicles of the 13<sup>th</sup> century, a strange gap can be clearly discerned. Almost none of the modern historians who dealt with Thomas's *Chronicle* noted the fact that the work of the Split archdeacon reflects the royal rule of his era. The matter, however, is easily explained. Thomas was mostly, and with every right seen as one of the heralds of the new, communal spirit<sup>1</sup> that gained momentum on the eastern coast of the Adriatic precisely in his lifetime. The fact that the Split chronicler was among the first people to articulate a new view on society and its system, even personally

<sup>1</sup> Compare e.g. T. RAUKAR, *Hrvatsko srednjovjekovlje*, Zagreb 1997, pp. 370-3. I will not consider here that current in the historiography which puts Thomas in the context of "Roman-Slavic (Croatian)" antagonisms, looking at him as a "Roman who does not understand and despises Slav, Croatian people in the hinterland" (the quote, as the newest example, is from E. HERCIGONJA, *Tropismena i trojezična kultura hrvatskog srednjovjekovlja*, Zagreb 1994, p. 123), because I believe that such categories cloud reality of the medieval world. The observation in Z.J. KOSZTOLNYIK, *Hungary in the Thirteenth Century*, Boulder 1996, p. 193 n. 1, according to which Thomas "did not like the Hungarians", belongs, but only seemingly, to the same kind of distorted interpretation. However, the issue here is much deeper lack of understanding, even author's ignorance. Earlier on in the same text (KOSZTOLNYIK, *o.c.*, p. 184) the author turns the city of Klis, near Split, into something he calls "Kl(ar)issa" and then proclaims the counts of Krk forefathers of the noble house of Zrinski (it is obvious that Kosztolnyik does not know that "Bribirski", "Šubići" and "Zrinski" are branches of the same noble clan) etc. etc. From such mistakes it is possible to conclude that Kosztolnyik is not on familiar terms with the medieval Croatia. It is no wonder that he did not understand Thomas correctly. An example of proper understanding of Thomas's perception of his place in relation to the "city" and the "hinterland" may be found in N. IVIĆ, *Domisljanje prošlosti*, Zagreb 1992, specially at p. 190, where he states that the chronicler was not a "latinophile because he was perhaps of Latin origin, but because he believed the Latin administration to correspond to the absolute and eternal values ...; the Latin administration for him guarantees survival of the proper lay hierarchy, and in turn the proper hierarchy guarantees expression of values on which the whole world is based". In addition to Ivić's work, M. MATIJEVIĆ-SOKOL, *Regimen Latinorum* arhidakona Tome u teoriji i praksi", *Historijski zbornik* LII/1999, also may be an example of the approach to Thomas's work that is appropriate for the medieval world and the original context in which it was situated.

participating in its realisation, does not mean that other elements of his wider understanding of the social system should be neglected. Even more so since the “communal spirit” itself, as a system of ideas about the society and its order, has to be regarded in the most profound sense of the word an integral part of the political landscape of the medieval world<sup>2</sup>. It is necessary to remind reader that, through his personal experiences and contacts, Thomas was in a position to get the information and knowledge regarding mechanisms through which some of the most important political authorities of his times acted. For instance: in the dispute with Archbishop Guncel he learned from direct experience about the papal monarchical rule at the peak of its power - he was personally received by Pope Gregory IX and then personally lead the dispute at the papal curia. In the service of his city authorities he was presented on several occasions to the Hungarian-Croatian king Bela IV, one of the most important European rulers of the time. At the royal court he discussed important political issues, and had most surely discussions on historic issues, which I tried to describe more clearly on an earlier occasion<sup>3</sup>. Due to his education in Bologna and later his personal contacts and travels, the Split archdeacon was a man of broad horizons and his views reflected the entirety of the world in which he moved and worked. On the pages of his *Chronicle* he freely moved from India, via Russia, Byzantium, Hungary, Serbia to Italy, Germany and France. Thomas knows by name not only the past and contemporary emperors and their activities, popes and rulers of his own kingdom, but he also precisely knows the name of the Russian prince of the principality of Vladimir who suffered a defeat in a conflict with Mongols. All of this makes it possible to search in the *Chronicle* for the elements reflecting an image of the royal rule, as it was seen by Thomas himself and his fellow-citizens and contemporaries.

In order to do this we need to bear in mind some important methodological notes, which help us with interpretation in this respect. We must start from the fact that Thomas was writing the history of the “Salonitan” church and the history of his town, putting them together to the best of his abilities in the context of the contemporary developments, thus creating a coherent construct<sup>4</sup>. His final work, *Salonitan Histories* or *Chronicles*, however, seen from today’s perspective is characterised by another feature - it abounds in rounded “images” which, according to modern interpretative schemes, occupy the ground between **the imaginary** and **the ideological** as defined by Jacques Le Goff, or which can be understood even more precisely in the category of the “social knowledge”<sup>5</sup>. Due to such “images” the work of the Split chronicler surpasses “the simple material experience”. He supplements his “material experience” with a content of legends and myths, “common knowledge” available to a well-educated intellectual of his time and information obtained from documents which were available to him. Thomas, for example, shows that he is familiar with the Croatian myth on the origin of the ethnic community, a kind of *origo gentis* in which the settlement of Dalmatia by

<sup>2</sup> Compare for example S. REYNOLDS, *Kingdoms and Communities in Western Europe 900-1300*, Oxford 1993, pp. 155-219; J. QUILLET, “Community, counsel and representation”, in: J.H. BURNS (ed.), *The Cambridge History of Medieval Political Thought c. 350-c.1450*, Cambridge 1988.

<sup>3</sup> M. ANČIĆ, “Desetljeće od godine 1091. do 1102. u zrcalu vrela“, *Povijesni prilozii* 17/1998, pp. 240-4.

<sup>4</sup> Thomas’s procedure, motives and methodology are extensively and successfully tackled by IVIĆ, o.c.

<sup>5</sup> For the categories of the “imaginary”, the “symbolic” and the “ideological” in the historical analysis of the products of human mind cf. J. LE GOFF, “L’imaginaire de Radovan/Imaginaro kod Radovana”, in: I. BABIĆ (ed.), *Majstor Radovan i njegovo doba. Zbornik radova međunarodnog znanstvenog skupa održanog u Trogiru 26-30. rujna 1990 godine*, Trogir 1994. For a theoretically developed approach to these categories see the “Foreword” in: IIDEM, *Srednjovjekovni imaginarij* (orig. *L’imaginaire médiéval*), Zagreb 1993, pp. 7-12, and E. PATLAGEAN, “Storia dell’immaginario”, in: J. LE GOFF (ed.), *La nuova storia* (orig. *La nouvelle histoire*), Milano 1980. The concept of the “imaginary” defined in this manner and developed, in addition to the older category of the “mentality”, is rather plausibly subjugated to the interpretative scheme of the “social knowledge” in O.G. OEXLE, “Perceiving Social Reality in the Early and High Middle Ages: A Contribution to a History of Social Knowledge” (orig. “Deutungsschemata der sozialen Wirklichkeit im frühen und hohen Mittelalter: Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des Wissens”) in: B. JUSSEN (ed.), *Ordering Medieval Society*, Philadelphia 2001, pp. 92-7.

Croats was described. He is also aware of and accepts the identification of Huns and Hungarians, which was widespread in the Europe of his time<sup>6</sup>.

By adding his personal observations and conclusions to his writing, the author enters in the area of **the imaginary**. However, his text is not only a literary product in which images of processed reality are used just for the construction of a "story"<sup>7</sup>. By selecting from the available material what he considered relevant and by writing his *Chronicle* he gives a new interpretation of the familiar events, creating in this way a unique "system of explaining the world", which brings his work also into the field of **the ideological**<sup>8</sup>. Since, however, Thomas speaks about his fellow-citizens and contemporaries, their beliefs, deeds and reactions to the outside world, building them into his "images", he is indeed to a certain extent uncovering what Oexle calls the "social knowledge" of his time.

In the work of the Split chronicler therefore one should not look for explicit and detailed descriptions of individual elements of social reality such as treaties, for example, on the nature of royal rule and the ways in which it operates in the described time and space. On the other hand *Salonitan History* is not only a "literary work" in which the author creates a new "story" independent of the real events. His story is a coherent construct with a clear ideological foundation. It is composed of different elements containing images of real relations. Many of them reflect more or less widespread attitudes characteristic of the time, thus outlining the spiritual landscape ("the imaginary", "the ideological", "social knowledge") of the world in which the author lived. Taking all of this into account I will analyze some of those images Thomas provides. Based on the explicit and implicit attitudes of these images, I will portray author's attitude as well as the attitude of his contemporaries, towards the royal rule.

The first of those images is the sequence from the conflict of brothers, the Hungarian-Croatian king Henry (Emeric) and the "Duke of Croatia" (*dux tocius Sclavoniae*) Andrew, later King Andrew II, which took place at the very beginning of the 13<sup>th</sup> century<sup>9</sup>. Thomas does not consider the reasons for the conflict, but rather points out the obedience to political authority showed by the Split Archbishop Bernard. He "in a very good and honourable way obeyed" (*satis bene et honeste obsecutus est*) the duke, who was a supreme political authority in his province, despite duke's quarrel with his brother the King. All of this could be checked and confirmed in the contemporary documents<sup>10</sup>. Continuing his narration, Thomas

<sup>6</sup> Thomas writes about the origin of Croats because he wants to offer to his readers (i.e. listeners) new conclusions on the collapse of Salona (on this compare IVIĆ, o.c., p. 85). As a warning that here the Split chronicler uses Croatian "myth of origin" and on excerpting of the contents of that myth see M. ANČIĆ, "Od karolinškoga dužnosnika do hrvatskoga vladara. Hrvati i karolinško carstvo u prvoj polovici IX. stoljeća", *Radovi Zavoda za povijesne znanosti HAZU u Zadru* 40/1998. Regarding the widespread equalising of Huns and Hungarians in Europe of the 13<sup>th</sup> century cf. J. SCÜCS, *Theoretical Elements in Master Simon of Kezas's Gesta Hungarorum (Studia Historica Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae 96)*, Budapest 1975, pp. 18-9. For the way in which Thomas otherwise used documents which he knew and which were available to him see M. MATIJEVIĆ-SOKOL, "Starohrvatski Solin u Kronici Tome arhidakona", *Vjesnik za arheologiju i historiju dalmatinsku* 85/1992.

<sup>7</sup> How is it possible to discern the picture of social relations of a time, actually an picture similar to the one which represented a part of the mental landscape of the Split chronicler - the picture of the royal authority, is shown in F. GRAUS, "Littérature et mentalité médiévales: le roi et le peuple", *Historica* XVI/1969.

<sup>8</sup> M. MATIJEVIĆ-SOKOL, "Regimen latinorum ..." clearly demonstrated how Thomas constructs the "system of explaining the world".

<sup>9</sup> The whole story is rendered in the Chapter 23 of the Chronicle, entitled *De Bernardo archiepiscopo*. The Latin text of the Chronicle is edited in F. RAČKI (ed.), THOMAS ARCHIDIACONUS, *Historia Salonitana (Monumenta spectantia historiam Slavorum meridionalium 26, Scriptorum 3)*, Zagrabiae 1894. For the story of brotherly conflict see pp. 81-2.

<sup>10</sup> The presence of Archbishop Bernard in the suite of Duke Andrew was recorded in three preserved documents issued by the Duke during 1200 (unfortunately none of them was dated more precisely, so it needs to be assumed that all three documents were issued in a very short period of time). They are documents by which Andrew gives a possession in Šibenik as a gift to the monastery of Ss. Cosmas and Damjan [T. SMIČIKLAS (ed.), *Diplomatički*

stresses that a large number of Hungarians joined the rebellious duke, but finds it appropriate to add that their act was "illegitimate" (*non legitime adhererant*). In other words it is "legitimate" (*legitime*) in God's as well as the natural right, that every subject is loyal to his ruler. Here I would like to stress the overtone of admiration and awe that the chronicler shows in the part of his text in which he explicitly states the ideal image of the social authority of the royal rule. In presenting the development of the conflict, Thomas describes how King Henry found himself in an almost hopeless situation in conflict with much stronger forces of his rebellious brother. At that moment, and this is the part stressed by Thomas, the King "inspired from the heavens" (*celitus inspiratus*) decided to make a brave move - walk in unarmed amongst the rebellious forces. There, according to Thomas, surrounded by a multitude of armed adversaries he shouted out: "Now I shall see who will dare to raise hand to shed royal blood" (*Nunc uidebo, qui erit ausus manum extendere ad cruorem regalis prosapie*). According to the chronicler's words, such an appeal to charismatic authority of the "royal blood" made the rebels surrender in obedience to the king, who therefore recreated the well-established order. Thereafter, the king himself showed mercy by incarcerating the rebellious brother and sparing his life.

It needs to be noted that Thomas was not the direct witness of those events. Thus, it could be assumed without much problem that he merely passes on the legendary story that he could have heard during one of his sojourns at the royal court. Contemporary documents, on the other hand, do not in any way corroborate the story of the Split chronicler. According to the contemporary documents King Henry captured his brother "without arms", but they mention a "bluff", i.e. a "trick" (*dolo captum*)<sup>11</sup>. If we add the fact that the contemporary sources confirm that Duke Andrew indeed spent some time imprisoned in Kneginac near Varaždin<sup>12</sup>, it becomes clear that Thomas's narration was not completely removed from the real events, but it also becomes clear that the events in his narration often acquire a meaning he wanted to attach to them.

However, what needs to be stressed here is the fact that Thomas's sympathies in the story of the conflict between the brothers are, as usual, with the one who obeys the written and unwritten rules and customs that the author himself regards as valuable and valid. From this context follows the conclusion that the nobility and Hungarian aristocrats, who supported Duke Andrew, did this "illegally". In addition, words which Thomas is putting into the mouth of King Henry, as well as the effect they had, embody the medieval understanding of the royal rule and its charisma: the king is above everyone and is untouchable. He is not to be contradicted in words, let alone in arms. In the medieval world, which a Czech historian F. Graus characterises as "monarchical", the king is the real pillar of the community, the element insuring its stability, the "head" of the society, as they used to say at the time. In this world the state power is concentrated in king's person and he is the centre of the state. Such an image is so powerful that Thomas's somewhat younger contemporary Giles from Rome, writing between 1277 and 1279 a treatise intended for the future French King Phillip the Fair, even states that the king is "almost a semi-god" (*quasi semideus*)<sup>13</sup>. From the context of such un-

*zbornik kraljevine Hrvatske, Dalmacije i Slavonije* II, Zagreb 1904, p. 357], confirms the possession of the land called Katić to a certain Kačeta [J. BARBARIĆ-J. MARKOVIĆ (ed.), *Diplomatički zbornik kraljevine Hrvatske, Dalmacije i Slavonije. Dodaci I*, Zagreb 1998, pp. 60-1] and presents the possession of St. Vital as a gift to the people of Trogir (unpublished document preserved as transcript by Ivan Lucić in his manuscript heritage; on this occasion I used transcripts of Lucić's manuscript heritage that are kept in Arhiv HAZU, LUCIUS XX-12/XI, fol. 27-8).

<sup>11</sup> Cf. KOSZTOLNYIK, o.c., pp. 30-1.

<sup>12</sup> The introductory part (arenga) of the privilege of the borough of Varaždin, issued in Andrew's name when he was already the king, in 1209, tackles this issue (cf. *Diplomatički zbornik* III/1905, p. 89).

<sup>13</sup> On ideal image of king's position and place in society see GRAUS, o.c., pp. 23-4, and J. DUNBABIN, "GovernmentČ, in: J.H. BURNS (ed.), *The Cambridge History ...*, pp. 480-8, where there are cases of the king being mentioned as the "head" of society and where the text by Giles of Rome is excerpted.

derstanding, which Thomas most probably gathered and adopted during his education in Bologna, it becomes completely clear why for the Split chronicler the moment in which the society, the community of the kingdom, remains without this pillar practically means decapitation. Precisely such an image is created by Thomas when he narrates how the Hungarian rulers acquired the Croatian kingdom. In his words, after the death of the King Zvonimir “the entire line of royal blood disappeared” (*tota regalis sanguinis deficiente prosapia*)<sup>14</sup>. The motif of “royal blood” appears here as well as in the afore mentioned story of the conflict between Henry and Andrew. Properly this “royal blood” (*sanguis regalis*), which nobody dares to shed, is the foundation on which the power and authority of the ruler rest. However, to this “natural right of the royal blood”, on the basis of which the ruler can act independently and according to which the Hungarian king could rightfully conquer the Croatian kingdom, Thomas counterpoints another element which is higher-ranked in his own view - the authority of the imperial power and the authority of God’s representative on Earth, the Pope. This can be clearly seen in Thomas’s interpretation of the way the Croatian king Držislav acquired his new title at the end of the 10<sup>th</sup> century. According to Thomas Držislav received from Constantinople symbols of royal power and after him the “rest of his successors had the title of kings of Dalmatia and Croatia”. The imperial right to confer a kingly title is here counterpoised by the Thomas’s statement that at the same time Držislav’s successors had “lordship” (*dominium*) in the kingdom through “inheritance from fathers and great grandfathers of their descent”<sup>15</sup>. On the other hand, the papal authority is confirmed by the cases of Stephen, Geza’s son, who “**having obtained a royal crown from the Pope**” becomes the “first Hungarian king”, as well as by the case of Great Reeve of Serbia Stefan (Nemanjić), who “having sent envoys to the Roman See, **secured from the Pope Honorius the royal crown**”<sup>16</sup>. According to such understanding of this world’s hierarchy of power and authority, Thomas was in the intellectual mainstream of his time, particularly that part which was developed by the papal curia and its pamphleteers. This is even more clearly confirmed by the use of the term “royal crown”<sup>17</sup>, in the sense of the symbol of the rule of a charismatic king, however unclear and inconsistent it may sometimes be.

<sup>14</sup> Thomas speaks about the conquest of the Kingdom of Croatia after Zvonimir’s death in Chapter 17, from which the quote is taken. See RAČKI, o.c. p. 57.

<sup>15</sup> The whole paragraph of the Latin text reads as follows: *Ab isto Dirsciscla(u) ceteri successores eius reges Dalmatie et Croatiae appellati sunt. Recipiebant enim regie dignitatis insignia ab imeperatoribus Constantinopolitanis, et dicebantur eorum eparchi siue patritii. Habebant namque ex successione sue originis patrum et proaurorum dominium regni Dalmatie et Croatiae* - RAČKI, o.c., pp. 38-9. Construction that Thomas created here seems to be based on an unknown, lost document that the Split chronicler had in front of him. On wider circumstances into which those events should be placed see M. ANČIĆ, “Srednjovjekovni montaneji”, *Starohrvatska prosvjeta* 24/1997, p. 140.

<sup>16</sup> The Latin text correspondingly reads as follows: *His temporibus Stephanus Gejze filius **per romanum pontificem coronam regni adeptus**, primus rex Hungarorum effectus est* - RAČKI, o.c., p. 46 (bolded by M.A.). *Eodem tempore Stephanus dominus Seruie siue Rasie, qui mega iupanus appellabatur, missis apochrisariis ad romanam sedem, impetrauit ab Honorio summo pontifice **coronam regni*** - RAČKI, o.c., p. 91 (bolded by M.A.)

<sup>17</sup> For a contemporary understanding of hierarchy of the earthly authority originating in the papal curia, with which Thomas’s views coincide, comp O. HAGENEDEDER, “Il dominio del mondo nel medioevo” (orig. “Weltherrschaft im Mittelalter”, *Mitteilungen des Instituts für Österreichische Geschichtsforschung* 93/1985), in: IDEM, *Il sole e la luna. Papato, impero e regni nella teoria e nella prassi dei secoli XII e XIII*, Milano 2000. For the development of parallel, but different understanding, according to which there is no authority above kings of individual kingdoms cf. DUNBABIN, o.c., pp. 481-2. The understanding according to which the “royal crown” (*corona regni*) represents “a series of rights and authorities linked to the royal authority, which pertain to every king as the heir to the monarchy, and not as an individual”, was wholly developed exactly in this context, in France for example, already in the second half of the 12<sup>th</sup> century (J. STRAYER, “Defense of the realm and royal power in Francia”, in: *Studi in onore di Gino Luzzato* 1, Milano 1949, p. 291). However, Thomas’s understanding is much closer to the one prevailing in the Hungarian-Croatian kingdom and in the court of the Arpad dynasty, where *corona regni* was, during his times a well known concept, but symbolised the wholeness of the **dynasty’s** authority.

As Kantorowicz showed in his classical work, such charismatic king received by the beginning of the 13<sup>th</sup> century a role of only legitimate lawmaker and the supreme interpreter of the law<sup>18</sup>. This is presumably the knowledge that Thomas acquired while studying in Bologna in the 20's of the same century. On the other hand, in the Hungarian-Croatian kingdom of Thomas's time, the king is still an absolute "master" (*dominus*). In this kingdom to be "noble" essentially means to be "king's servant", a part of a wide circle of king's *familia*. It is possible to become a member of this circle only by means of royal intervention, by his grace. In metaphorical sense, it means to enter the royal home, to become a member of the wider king's suite<sup>19</sup>. Thomas creates such picture of the king when he describes the sojourn of Bela IV in the remnants of an old monastery, by then only the church of St. Peter in Klobučac near the city of Trogir. In the already prepared lodging, as Thomas narrates, the king "stayed for a few days with a large suite consisting of various nationalities. For instance, the multitude of nations came to him as the ruler, to settle various businesses in his presence"<sup>20</sup>.

Such an image of the "royal highness", drawn by the chronicler but forming a part of what is already indicated as the "social knowledge", is realised in the real life most clearly on ceremonial occasions, such as the one when in 1217 the King Andrew II went on a crusade. Thomas presents in full colour and in great detail the king's arrival to Split where, accompanied by his suite, he boarded ships that would take them to the Holy Land. His detailed account of the episode clearly shows that the impressions from the early youth were carved deep in his memory (at this time the chronicler was a seventeen-year old youth preparing to leave for Italy in order to continue his education there). According to his words "all the citizenry and all foreigners, and the entire multitude of his army forming the procession welcomed the king chanting to him loud praises. Then the entire clergy, wearing silk robes on the top of their normal clothes, walking with crosses and censers to Pistura, sang as befitting his royal highness. When the illustrious king saw the ceremonious congregation of the procession, he immediately dismounted from his horse surrounded by a great multitude of his champions, while the bishops held him from both sides, and went on foot to the Church of St. Duimus"<sup>21</sup>. After the king was royally entertained, his turn came to reciprocate - by his goodness and special "grace". This he also did, according to Thomas, in such a way that he "started to demonstrate great generosity towards the citizens of Split as he by his own accord provoked them to ask from him what he could cede to them for the public benefit" thus providing "royal acts of kindness, which he granted to them gracefully and generously"<sup>22</sup>. As usual when he uses already existing images (magnificent reception, which provokes the king

<sup>18</sup> F.H. KANTOROWICZ, *The King's Two Bodies. A Study in Medieval Political Theology*, Princeton 1997, pp. 97-143.

<sup>19</sup> SCÜCS, o.c., p. 36. The formulation in M. RADY, *Nobility, Land and Service in Medieval Hungary*, London 2000, p. 44, seems to be more precise, especially regarding the situation in the medieval Croatia and Slavonia. It says that "an aristocrat was aristocrat by birth, by his possession of the land and because his comrades and relatives considered him to be aristocrat. Nevertheless, his nobility primarily followed from his direct relation towards the ruler and dedicated performance of loyal service which he was obliged to render to the king".

<sup>20</sup> Thomas describes the sojourn of King Bela IV "in the church" (and the remnants of the former monastery) of St. Peter in Klobučac in Chapter 48. The Latin text is in RAČKI, o.c., pp. 206-7. On the monastery, the time of its destruction and the church that remained after it - see V. OMAŠIĆ, *Povijest Kaštela*, Split 1986, pp. 95-105.

<sup>21</sup> Exierunt autem processionaliter obuiam domino regi uniuersi ciues, omnesque forenses, totaque turba sui exercitus, laudes ei altis uocibus concrepantes. Deinde clerus omnis (h)olosericus super comptas induti uestibus, cum crucibus et thuribulis procedentes usque postirum, prout regie maganificentie dignum erat pariter, concinebant. Ipse uero illustris rex, uiso processionis cetu solempni, statim descendit de equo, magnaue suorum principum uallatus caterua, tenentibus eum hinc inde episcopis, qui conuenerant, pedes usque ad ecclesiam sancti *Domnii processit* - RAČKI, o.c., p. 89.

<sup>22</sup> *Tunc rex cepit magnam benignitatem erga spalatenses ciues ostendere, ita ut ipse ultro prouocaret eos ad petendum a se, quod eis ad publicum cederet commodum.* - RAČKI, o.c., p. 90. G. ALTHOFF, "(Royal) Favor" (orig. "Huld: Überlegungen zu einem Zentralbegriff der mittelalterlichen Herrschaftsordnung", *Frühmittelalterliche Studien* 25/1991), in: JUSSSEN (ed.), *Ordering ...*, tackles in detail the royal "grace" as one of the central categories of the "social knowledge".

to show “grace”), Thomas actually wants to add what the real events reveal in a deeper sense. In this deeper sense his intention is to point to the real nature of his fellow-citizens, and the point of the entire presentation is that “people of Split, are as usual too slow when it comes to public affairs but as individuals, they aspire to obtain personal benefits” (*Spalatense, suo more, ad publica nimis tardi, ad priuata commoda singuli intendebant*), and therefore practically refused what the king so generously offered to them. However, regardless of many layers of chronicler’s intentions, his text represents most probably the only detailed description of the ceremony of “entry of the king into the city” from the 12<sup>th</sup> and 13<sup>th</sup> centuries, the ceremony which in the Croatian cities of the time took place relatively rarely, because the Hungarian-Croatian kings of the Arpad dynasty rarely came to this kingdom of theirs. Luckily, the same image of “king’s entry into the city” was annotated in another, completely different source, a ruler’s document or even more precisely, in the document of the Croatian Duke Andrew, the future king Andrew II.

The document dates from 1200 and is preserved only as a transcript of a 17<sup>th</sup> century historian Ivan Lucić-Lucius. In it the duke, much more concisely than Thomas, tells almost the same story: “We entered the city in which we were received by the clergy and all the people together with respect and joy and we listened to laudatory hymns”<sup>23</sup>. As in 1217 in Split, Andrew on this occasion also responded by expressions of royal “grace” to such a welcome, which he interpreted as a sign of true and profound devotion of the inhabitants of Trogir. He listened to the request, as the document says, “of bishop, clergy and people” who organised the reception<sup>24</sup>. After the procedure of verification of truthfulness of the pronounced statements, he confirmed the city’s possession of the Church of St. Vital and the surrounding territory.

Regardless of their infrequency, such ceremonies had a very important social role, because the ideal order of the world was materialised and visualised through the use of the various symbols<sup>25</sup>. On the other hand, the order presented in Thomas’s image of the “entry of the king into the city” shows in much more detail, compared to the one in the document of Duke Andrew, that in the early 13<sup>th</sup> century there is still no awareness of the role and significance of the city commune. City leaders at this time had no active role in the ceremonial. The king is shown into the city by the gathered bishops of the “land”<sup>26</sup> who took him to the cathedral, while the citizens only have a passive role of chanting “praises” (*laudae*) and the role of observers of this “heavenly” sight. Chronicler’s description here seems to paraphrase the idea of the king as “nearly a semi-god” - supported by the bishops and surrounded by his suite, offering thereafter his “grace” to the citizens, he is completely outside and above the world of his subjects. The image gains its proper meaning if it is compared with, for example, the ceremony organised 180 years later on the occasion of the entry of King Sigmund into Dubrovnik in 1396. On this occasion the Rector of Dubrovnik with the members of the Senate (and not the archbishop with the gathered suffragan bishops) ceremoniously handed him over the keys to the city and immediately received them back, and the king pro-

<sup>23</sup> The quote reads in Latin as follows: *ciuitatem intrauimus ubi una a clero et uniuerso populo cum honore et gaudio recepti laudes ymnidicas honorabiliter recepimus*, and originates in the document issued by Duke Andrew, mentioned here in the footnote 10 (Arhiv HAZU, Lucius XX-12/XI, fol. 27-8).

<sup>24</sup> Arhiv HAZU, Lucius XX-12/XI, fol. 27: *Attendentes ergo episcopi, cleri ac populi piam et largam deuotionem ueridicis eorum suggestionibus aures nostre serenitatis accommodauimus et in petitione sua eos iusta clementer exaudiuimus*.

<sup>25</sup> There is an abundant literature on such ceremonial feasts, but it is sufficient to refer here to the collection entitled *City and Spectacle in Medieval Europe* (ed. B.A. HANAWALT and K.L. REYERSON), Minneapolis-London 1994. LE GOFF, o.c. , p. 12, counts the ceremony of “king’s entry” among the “great medieval ‘images’ ... more or less sophisticated depending on social conditions and cultural level”.

<sup>26</sup> For the concept of “land”, as used here and supposedly understood as such by the chronicler, see O. BRUNNER, *Land and Lordship. Structures of Governance in Medieval Austria (orig. Land und Herrschaft. Grundfragen der territorialen Verfassungsgeschichte Österreichs im Mittelalter)*, Philadelphia 1992.

ved his magnitude by rich material gifts<sup>27</sup>. The difference between these two ceremonies set apart by the time distance of nearly two centuries demonstrates perhaps most clearly the trajectory of the city commune and the spirit prevailing in it. At the beginning of the 13<sup>th</sup> century the “city” is still, in spite of a special legal position affirmed by the royal privileges, an integral part of the “land”, whereas at the end of 14<sup>th</sup> century it is already a separate entity, whose independence is symbolically shown by acceptance of the “keys to the city” from the royal hands, similarly as the royal “grace” is now only symbolic and materialised in rich gifts. In addition to all of this it has to be noted that even the description of the Andrew’s departure to a crusade clearly confirms how Thomas often subjugates real events to his wider ideas, his “system of explanation of the world”. After a vivid description of king’s entry into the city, the Split chronicler describes his crusade as a series of grand successes and marvellous victories frustrated only by “forces of evil”. This description has very little support in the picture of the events that can be drawn from contemporary documentary sources. The campaign was everything but “conquest of fortresses and cities and overcoming of all obstacles” (*expugnans castra et uillas, et obstantia queque conculcans*) as Thomas presents it<sup>28</sup>. A modern historian describes the reality of the crusade as a “complete military and diplomatic disaster”<sup>29</sup>. Of course, the insight of today’s historian is significantly different from the memories and traditions prevailing at the royal court where Thomas most probably gathered his information<sup>30</sup>. However, the differences between the reality and the presented image are still too big, so it must be assumed that the Split chronicler simply could not acknowledge a “crusade”, undertaken according to the Pope’s orders, as a disaster. At the same time it was difficult to “award” the king, who distinguished himself by the “grace” offered to the people of Split, if only solely in a chronicler’s text, with a presentation of failures in the Holy Land.

The Split chronicler is perfectly aware that the “charismatic king” must be presented in public in a spectacular way, in his full ceremonial lustre. Therefore the ceremonial occasions are the moments when the king appears decorated by the symbols of his authority: the crown, the sceptre, the mantle, the objects that by their sheer appearance and symbolic value provoke simultaneous admiration and awe. Thomas was himself a witness of several such occasions. In addition to the already mentioned description of Andrew’s “entry into the city” in the year 1217 a shorter, but still interesting description of “entry into the city” of Bela IV has to be underlined. The ruler’s arrival to Split was organised in full splendour of royal luxury, as Thomas says, “with much vanity”, whereby the ruler enters the city “carrying the signs of his royal authority as the king”<sup>31</sup>. Thomas’s reliance on the “imaginary”, on the already established image in the conscience of his audience about what the “king’s entry” looks like and what the symbols of his authority and position are, is clearly visible in this description. However, Thomas shows that it is completely clear to him that Bela IV, like other contemporary European rulers, is using such public appearances to promote a desired image of himself and royal person in general<sup>32</sup>. But, already used to the close and direct human contact with the king on one side, and on the other side seeing him in the first place

<sup>27</sup> For the description of Sigismund’s entry into Dubrovnik see Z. JANEKOVIĆ RÖMER, *Okvir slobode*, Zagreb-Dubrovnik 1999, p. 315.

<sup>28</sup> The Latin text containing description of Andrew’s crusade see in RAČKI, o.c., pp. 91-2. The quote originates from p. 92.

<sup>29</sup> Cf. KOSZTOLNYIK, o.c., pp. 60-71.

<sup>30</sup> The image of Andrew’s crusade, similar to Thomas’s, is provided by his contemporary, Hungarian chronicler Simon de Keza - cf. E. SZENTPÉTERY (ed.), *Scriptores rerum Hungaricarum tempore ducum regumque stirpis Arpadianae gestarum* I, Budapest 1937, p. 184.

<sup>31</sup> RAČKI, o.c., p. 207: cum multa ambitione, sicut rex regalia gerens insignia.

<sup>32</sup> Regarding such behaviour of contemporary European kings cf. L.M. BRYANT, “Paris and London during the Dual Monarchy”, in: *City and Spectacle ...*, p. 13. Hungarian historiography still has not provided an answer to the questions what were the models for Hungarian-Croatian kings in establishing these customs, how such influences were transferred and what was their real influence.



as the pillar of order and justice in the society, our chronicler cannot help noticing the bragging manner which the king displays on the occasion.

It is this observation which directs us towards the other side of Thomas's image of the royal authority, the one in which his personal experience and observation came to the forefront. He severely reproaches the royal couple, Bela IV and Maria, whom he got to know very well. However, his criticisms are stated in a veiled manner, significantly differently from the one in which he reproaches his fellow-citizens and other contemporaries described in his narratives. This overtone of reproach can be felt also in Thomas's description of the royal audience in the home of the Split citizen Nikola Dujmov during which the king "received the people of Split who came to him in large numbers very benevolently and listened to them pretending to be very kind and cheerful" (*ciues uero ad ipsum frequenter accedentes ualde benigne suscipiebantur et audiebantur ab ipso, affabilem se ac serenum eis plurimum exhibendo*)<sup>33</sup>. While describing king's attempt to create a public perception of himself as an embodiment of the image of the ideal ruler<sup>34</sup>, Thomas seems to leave an unfinished sentence indicating his veiled reproach. Actually, it seems that Thomas hardly restrains himself from adding that it is all only a part of the royal show, like carrying the symbols of the royal power, and what the king really thinks and intends remains known only to a small number of insiders. Also, when he describes the way in which he represented his municipality in front of the king after the conflict with Queen Maria, Thomas clearly indicates what can be described only as Queen's hypocrisy - she promised to the people of Split to intervene with the king in favour of liberation of imprisoned dignitaries, but during the audience she in fact accuses the people of Split "of many things" (*regina ... cepit Spalatenses accusare de multis*). Even the king is not spared criticism - he "believes too much to the words of his wife" (*rex autem nimis credulus uerbis sue uxoris*), and since she is so insincere and hypocritical this is not good - but an open qualification and criticism do not find their way to the chronicler's pen<sup>35</sup>!

Let us conclude: Thomas is fully aware of all the human weakness of his king, but the image of the ideal ruler, the pillar around which the entire social edifice is spinning, is too strong and too deeply-rooted in his philosophy of life to allow him to spoil it by open reproaches. The king is actually a figure by far surpassing the horizon of the daily life and all its developments. Only on extraordinary occasions, when the well-established order is disturbed and when things need to be harmonised again with the natural state of affairs he interferes with human lives and the lives of various communities of which Thomas is an integral part: his Split municipality, his "land" - Croatian kingdom and finally, the entire Hungarian-Croatian kingdom. These extraordinary situations are generally crisis points in the life of a community, sudden breakdowns in the continuity of the social life. This primarily means the wars, which break out due to human weaknesses and perversion, but also due to misunderstandings and misinterpretations. The royal authority intervenes here unquestioningly by the logic of the "only interpreter of the law", and whatever this intervention turns out to be Thomas does not have any objections to it. Another crisis point is death, for example the death of an archbishop. In those situations the king has his own ideas regarding the election of the new archbishop, and those differ greatly from Thomas's ideas. Thomas himself, in the spirit of the ideas developed in the papal curia since the times of the investiture contest in the second half of 11<sup>th</sup> century, believes that the election of the new head of church is above all a matter of the city clergy. He readily condemns most severely any interference with the election<sup>36</sup>. However, the situation changes when Bela suggests, and canons readily accept, the

<sup>33</sup> RAČKI, o.c., p. 207.

<sup>34</sup> GRAUS, o.c., p. 35, points out as characteristics of an ideal literary king that he is a just judge, pious and modest, a man who loves order and peace, protects the church, widows and orphans, and is feared by the ones doing evil.

<sup>35</sup> Thomas describes conflict with the queen in Chapter 49 - for the quoted words see RAČKI, o.c., p. 211.

preposit of Čazma, Hugrin. This is the only laymen's intervention to which Thomas does not have any objections, although he will maliciously add how "Hugrin's impertinence was not unknown to him" (*non ignota sibi erat insolentia Hugrini*)<sup>37</sup>.

Of course, the question arises here to what extent the chronicler consciously refrains from writing any unfavourable comment about the king, i.e. to what extent this refraining is a consequence of fear from the possible reaction. Thomas writes for the readers, even more precisely, the listeners who are present at the reading sessions, and this is not an intimate confession that will remain on the pages written for himself. His text and words - the words of a distinguished member of the city community for which his text is intended - do not have the same effect as the words spoken in the street, during quarrel or in anger. He is fully aware of all this and there should be no doubt that a part of his thoughts was channelled by self-censorship, in awareness that in the city in which he has already made enough enemies, there would be plenty of those who can hardly wait to report on the disrespect of the royal authority. Thomas's description of the visit of King Conrad to Split in 1251 evokes such an atmosphere of fear of accusations in front of the king. Conrad is furious because Archbishop Rogerius has left the city and refused to welcome him acting in accordance with the proclaimed papal anathema of the German king. He stayed in the archbishop's court where he was "turning the papers in the archives, which he found there, carefully studying them in order to find by some chance a document on the basis of which he could put a badge of shame on him (the archbishop) on grounds of disloyalty towards his king"<sup>38</sup>. However, even that represents a part of the entire image of the king and the ways in which he ascertains his authority as seen by our chronicler.

In the end we need to address the problem related to the perception of the presence and importance of the royal authority in Croatia during the times of the Arpad dynasty in modern historiography. In a nutshell the question should read as follows: What is the relation between Thomas's *Chronicle* and the attitude presented long ago by N. Klaić which is widely accepted in Croatian historiography: that the Arpad dynasty did not actually rule south of the mountain Gvozd<sup>39</sup>. The answer could be seemingly short and straightforward: Thomas provides in many places material for an answer completely opposite to the conclusion of N. Klaić. I will take as an example only his descriptions of actions during the election of archbishops after 1102. According to his account, out of the total of 14 elections of archbishops mentioned by Thomas only in the case of three the relation with the royal court was not taken into consideration. Archbishops in question are Girardo from Verona and Arnir who were elected in the second half of the 12<sup>th</sup> century, when a large part of Croatia, including Split, was ruled by the Byzantine Emperor Emanuel Comnenus. During the election of these prelates the people of Split asked for the papal intervention for political reasons questioning the superior authority of the ruler who was not a Catholic. The third case is the case of Archbishop Rogerius, Thomas's contemporary and the last archbishop about whom he speaks in

<sup>36</sup> IVIĆ, o.c., passim, clearly recognises and correctly insists on the fact that many Thomas's attitudes reflect ideas of reformed papacy.

<sup>37</sup> Thomas describes in detail the circumstances of Hugrin's election as Archbishop of Split in Chapter 45 (RAČKI, o.c., pp. 195-200), whereas he criticises his fellow-citizens about the election procedure, and only notes the role of the king. Quoted words in RAČKI, o.c., p. 196.

<sup>38</sup> *Rex idem uersando scrinii cartulas, quas idibidem (sc. in domibus episcopii) reperit, multum sollicito perquirebat, si forte aliquod inueniretur scriptum, ex quo posset ipsum (sc. archiepiscopum) de infidelitate sui regis infamie neuo notare* - RAČKI, o.c., 206. Accusation of "disloyalty" to the medieval ruler is a forerunner of the "verbal offence" of the totalitarian systems of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, so the consequences were not limited only to the "badge of shame" which leads to the above conclusion about a sort of chronicler's "self-censorship". Several examples of the medieval political supervision and repression see in ANČIĆ, "Desetljeće ...", pp. 234-6.

<sup>39</sup> On this problem with detailed presentation of attitudes by N. Klaić see M. ANČIĆ, *Putanja klatna. Ugarsko-hrvatsko kraljevstvo i Bosna u XIV. Stoljeću*, Zadar-Mostar 1997, pp. 241-53 and IDEM, "Srednjovjekovno vladarsko vlastelinstvo Drid. Problemi vlasništva i organizacija u XIII st.", *Povijesni prilozi* 19/2000, pp. 96-7.

his work. He was also elected through the papal intervention and with the clearly demonstrated dissatisfaction of King Bela IV. In the descriptions of the elections of all other 11 archbishops the Split chronicler varies the topic (*topos*) of the direct or indirect influence of the royal authority on the clergy and laymen. On the other hand, he regularly speaks about the wishes of the same laymen and clergy to secure influence in the ruler's circle by electing a person close to the royal court. Following Thomas's account, one would have to conclude that the people of Split in the course of a century and a half after 1102 in the elections of the archbishops normally acted according to the wish to secure the influence at the royal court. However, the impression that the issue here is *topos* provokes doubt about the extent to which the writer's text is based on real historical facts. In fact, it could be stated with certainty that the desire to have influence on the royal court represents only another element in the whole picture of the royal authority drawn by the chronicler. If the king is separated and above the society, surrounded by his close nobility and as such a source of "grace" that brings benefits to his subjects, then it is completely natural that it is necessary to find the right way to this "grace". This is possible only through those who surround the king. In addition, the mentioned doubt regarding the reliability of the chronicler's account of the events in which he did not participate is only augmented because breach of the canon rules and ideas which stem from the reformation times of the second half of the 11<sup>th</sup> century are the reason, in writer's interpretation of history, for God's wrath which in the form of various misfortunes overcome the city. On the other hand, when he speaks about the elections which he witnessed himself (Archbishops Guncel, Stephen, Hugrin and Rogerius), and in view of other facts which are uncovered by the author himself as well as preserved in contemporary documents, Thomas's observations and argumentations give us the right to conclude that during the rule of Bela IV, royal authority and power in Croatia were undisputed. Power and authority rested upon the widespread understanding of the nature of royal authority and right, as outlined by the chronicler himself, but what is as important, if not even more important, upon the real power which is secured by the royal army<sup>40</sup>. Starting from such a context, it is necessary to conclude that every individual account of the election of archbishops and motives that stood behind it need to be carefully examined. As to the issue of really present and efficient royal authority during the time Thomas describes as a historian, his narration cannot be taken as a basic argument.

### Slika kraljevske vlasti u djelu Tome arcidakona

Oslanjajući se na moderne interpretativne koncepte i sheme, autor razmatra pozadinu pripovijedanja splitskoga kroničara 13. stoljeća, Tome arcidakona. Iz društvenoga krajobraza koji splitski kroničar ocrtava nizom više ili manje detaljnih "slika", autor izabire "sliku" kralja i njegove vlasti. Raščlanjujući elemente te "slike" autor upozorava na raznolike elemente iz kojih se ona sastoji, pokušavajući u zaključku razabrati koliko Tomino pripovijedanje zrcali realnosti vremena u kojemu kroničar živi i djeluje. U djelu splitskoga kroničara nije moguće i ne treba tražiti eksplicitne i potanke opise pojedinih elemenata društvene stvarnosti, pogotovu ne traktate, primjerice o naravi kraljevske vlasti i načinu na koji se ona ostvaruje u vremenu i prostoru koji opisuje. S druge strane, *Salonitanska povijest* nije samo "književno djelo" u kojemu autor stvara jednu novu, i o realnim zbivanjima neovisnu "priču", nego cjeloviti konstrukt, s jasnom ideologijskom podlogom, sastavljen iz raznorodnih elemenata, od kojih mnogi sadrže slike realnih odnosa, kao što isto tako mnogi zrcale više ili manje raširena shvaćanja karakteristična za doba u kojemu je autor živio i na taj način ocrtavaju du-

<sup>40</sup> In the description of developments from 1243/44, Thomas excellently presents the way in which fall into royal "disfavour" due to disregard of royal orders leads to severe punishment of disobedience (RAČKI, o.c., pp. 191-9); cf. analysis of those developments in M. ANČIĆ, "Jesu li u 13. stoljeću vodene križarske vojne u Bosni", in: ISTI, *Na rubu Zapada. tri stoljeća srednjovjekovne Bosne*, Zagreb 2001, 98-101.

hovni krajobraz (“imaginarno”, “ideologijsko”, “društveno znanje”) svijeta u kojem je živio. Vođeci računa upravo o takvim metodološkim natuknicama u daljoj ću se raščlambi pokušati poslužiti određenim slikama koje Toma detaljno ocrtava, pokazujući time između ostaloga i koliko im važnost pridaje. Temeljem stavova ekspliciranih ili tek podrazumijevanih pri stvaranju tih slika nastojao sam ocrtati autorov odnos, ali i odnos njegovih suvremenika spram kraljevske vlasti.

Toma je posve svjestan svih ljudskih mana svoga kralja, ali slika idealnoga vladara, stožera oko kojega se vrte cijela građevina društva, previše je jaka i preduboko usadena u njegov svjetonazor da bi ju se kvarilo otvorenim prigovorima. Kralj je, zapravo, figura koja daleko nadilazi horizont dnevnoga života i svih njegovih gibanja, on se u ljudske ali i u živote različitih zajednica kojih je Toma integralni dio, njegove splitske općine, njegove “zemlje” - Hrvatskoga kraljevstva i, konačno, cijeloga Ugarsko-hrvatskog kraljevstva, upliće samo u izvanrednim prigodama, kada je ustaljeni red poremećen i kada stvari valja ponovno uskladiti s prirodnim stanjem. Te izvanredne situacije, krizne točke u životu zajednice, prije svega ostalog su ratovi, koji izbijaju zbog ljudskih slabosti i opačine, ali i zbog nesporazuma i krivih tumačenja. Kraljevska vlast tu neprikosnoveno intervenira logikom “jedinoga tumača zakona”, i kakva god ta intervencija bila Toma na nju nema zamjerki. Tu je još i smrt, kao u situacijama nakon smrti nadbiskupa. Kralj i oko toga ima svoje ideje, koje se umnogome razlikuju od Tominih. Sam Toma, naime, u duhu ideja koje papinska kurije zastupa još od reformskih vremena i sukoba oko investiture u drugoj polovici 11. stoljeća, smatra kako je izbor novoga crkvenog poglavara stvar prije svih gradskoga klera, i svako uplitanje u taj izbor spremno osuđuje najtežim riječima. No, stvari se mijenjaju kada Bela predlaže, a kanonici spremno prihvaćaju čazmanskoga prepozita Hugrina. Od svih laičkih intervencija jedino za ovu Toma nema nikakva komentara, iako će za Hugrina dometnuti kako mu “njegova drskost nije bila nepoznata”.

Može se sa sigurnošću reći da je želja za utjecajem na kraljevskome dvoru samo još jedan od elemenata ukupne slike kraljevske vlasti - ako je kralj izdvojen i iznad društva, opkoljen svojim bliskim velikašima i kao takav vrelo “milosti” koja donosi korist podanicima, onda je posve prirodno da treba naći i pravi put do te “milosti”, a to je moguće samo preko onih koji kralja okružuju. K tomu, izrečena se dvojba glede pouzdanosti kroničarevih prikaza događaja u kojima nije sam sudjelovao samo pojačava stoga što upravo laički utjecaj i politički obziri pri izboru nadbiskupa služe Tomi kao obrazloženje većine nevolja što su grad snalazile tijekom tih istih stoljeća i pol. Kršenje, naime, kanonskih propisa i shvaćanja koja potječu još iz reformnih vremena druge polovice 11. stoljeća razlogom su, u piščevoj interpretaciji povijesti, božjega gnjeva koji se u obliku različitih nesreća izlijevao na grad. S druge strane, kada govori o izborima kojima je i sam bio svjedokom (nadbiskupi Guncel, Stjepan, Hugrin i Rogerije), a s obzirom na druge činjenice koje otkriva, kako sam autor tako i sačuvani suvremeni dokumenti, Tomina opažanja i obrazloženja daju za pravo da se zaključi da su u vrijeme vladavine Bele IV. kraljevska moć i autoritet u Hrvatskoj uistinu neprijeporni. Moć i autoritet pri tome počivaju na raširenom shvaćanju naravi kraljevske vlasti i prava, onako kako ih ocrtava i sam kroničar, ali, što je isto tako važno ako ne i važnije, i na realnoj snazi koju priskrbljuje kraljevska vojska. Polazeći iz takva konteksta valja zaključiti da svaki pojedinačni prikaz izbora nadbiskupa i motiva koji su stajali iza njega valja podrobno pretresti, a za pitanje realno nazočne i učinkovite kraljevske vlasti u vrijeme koje Toma opisuje kao povjesničar njegovo se pripovijedanje ne može uzimati kao temeljni argument.