

THE MURDER OF QUEEN ELIZABETH – A CASE STUDY OF THE LATE MEDIEVAL POLITICAL PROPAGANDA *

Mladen Ančić

M. Ančić
Sveučilište u Zadru
Odjel za povijest
Ruđera Boškovića 5, HR-23000 Zadar
E-mail: mancic55@hotmail.com

10.1484/M.DEM-EB.5.121641

The paper is focused on the question whether the Queen Regent Elizabeth was murdered or died of natural causes during her imprisonment in January, 1387. In order to resolve ambiguities the author analyzes content of the narratio formula of the royal charter issued in the name of the Queen Mary on September 14, 1387, as well as contemporaneous literary texts – poem Carmen de Carolo Parvo written by Lawrence de Monacis and “diary-chronicle” of the Zadar patrician Paul de Paulo. After the thorough analysis the author concludes that different versions of the stories concerning the capture and imprisonment of the Queens Elizabeth and Mary were produced as a political propaganda serving the interests of two confronted political factions that formed the ruling stratum of the Kingdom of Hungary-Croatia.

Key words: *Kingdom of Hungary-Croatia, political factions, medieval political propaganda*

At the end of the 14th century, the large Kingdom of Hungary-Croatia was hit by a deep structural crisis, which vividly manifested itself as a clash of political factions, ultimately developing into a dynastic war that lasted for more than twenty years. The war started at the end of 1385, when Charles of Durazzo took over the royal throne from the fifteen-year-old Queen Mary, the daughter of Louis the Great (r. 1342-1382). Charles' rule lasted a mere thirty nine days; crowned on December 31, 1385, he was attacked and severely wounded on February 7, 1386, and died from those wounds on February 24, 1386. The political faction that brought Charles to Hungary-Croatia, led by the brothers de Horvathi – Paul, the Bishop of Zagreb, and John, the ban of Mačva (*Machou* – modern day Serbia) – and John de Palissna, the prior of the Hospitallers in Hungary-Croatia, took the murder of their candidate as a *casus belli*. Six months later, on July 25, they attacked the young Queen, her mother – the Queen Regent Elizabeth, and their entourage, on a road near the township of Djakovo (in modern-day Croatia), which was the seat of the Bishop of Bosnia. In the ensuing battle, the forces led by John de Horvathi and John de Palissna overpowered the royal forces, killing the most prominent members of the Queen's entourage and taking both Queen Mary and her mother Elizabeth prisoners, together with the surviving members of their entourage. Six months later, in mid-January of 1386, still in captivity in the fortress of Novigrad near Zadar on the eastern coast of Adriatic, the Queen Regent Elizabeth was murdered by her captors. In the meantime, the political center of the Kingdom was reconstituted by the most prominent barons of Hungary, who accepted as their leader

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

Mary's husband, Sigismund of Luxemburg, and even crowned him as King at the end of March, 1386. Queen Mary remained in custody of de Horvathi and de Palissna in Novigrad, and was finally liberated with the help of the Venetian fleet some six months later, probably on June 4 of the same year.

This, in short, with minor differences and, in some extreme cases, wild speculation in commentaries, is the story that has been repeated on numerous occasions over the last hundred and fifty years in modern national historiographies (Croatian, Hungarian, Slovak, Polish etc.).¹ My aim on this occasion is to pose the questions about, or rather, to challenge one of the "facts" in this story – namely, the circumstances surrounding the death of the Queen Regent Elizabeth. To put it simply, I maintain that Elizabeth died of natural causes, and that the story about her murder was a part of "political propaganda" of its time.² In order to prove my point, I will use the "diary" of Paul de Paulo, a patrician of Zadar, as well as the documents issued by the public notaries of Zadar during the first months of 1387 (registers kept by those notaries are conserved in the State Archives of Zadar, where I first met prof. Jakšić way back in 1986, who was then working on those same registers). My revised narrative of the captivity of the two Queens, developed here on the principle known as "thick description", will then be a starting point for some comments concerning the nature and functioning of the political center in the 14th century Kingdom of Hungary-Croatia.

The story of the murder of the Queen Regent Elizabeth hangs in reality on only one contemporaneous source – the *narratio* of the charter of donation issued by the royal chancery in the name of Queen Mary on September 14, 1387.³ However, this document is not a simple charter of donation,

¹ The story, interpreted as a "tragedy", has recently been repeated and commented on together with an overview of Hungarian and Polish historiography on the subject in S. A. SROKA, *The Imprisonment of the Hungarian Queens: Elizabeth of Bosnia and Mary (1386-1387), Quaestiones Mediae Aevi Novae*, 19, Warsaw, 2014, pp. 303-316. Although S. Sroka mentions the "Serbian and Croatian literature" (obviously as a substitute for now obsolete "Yugoslav literature"), it is quite clear from the works he cites (S. A. SROKA, *op. cit.* p. 305, n. 9) that he really did not bother to review this literature. If he had, he would have noticed that the subject has been of no interest to Serbian historians, while it has attracted Croatian historians from the times of Franjo Rački and gained a special status in the framework of meta-narrative of the national history. See F. RAČKI, *Pokret na slavenskom jugu koncem XIV. i početkom XV. stoljeća*, *Rad JAZU*, 2, Zagreb, 1868, p. 120 ff., whose ideas were later revised in F. ŠIŠIĆ, *Vojvoda Hrvoje Vukčić Hrvatinić i njegovo doba (1350-1416)*, Zagreb, 1903, p. 48 ff., and again in N. KLAIĆ, *Crtice o Vukovaru u srednjem vijeku*, Vukovar, 1983, p. 112 ff. For the way Hungarian and Slovak historiographies treated the problem, see E. MÁLYUSZ, *Kaiser Sigismund in Ungarn 1387-1437*, Budapest, 1990, pp. 20 ff.; P. ENGEL, *The Realm of St Stephen: A History of Medieval Hungary 895-1526*, London – New York, 2001, pp. 198 ff.; D. DVORÁKOVÁ, *Rytier a jeho kral: Stibor zo Stiboric a Žigmund Luxemburský*, Budmerice – Bratislava, 2010, 42-49.

² On late medieval political propaganda in general and with focus on Italy, France, and England, see: S. MENACHE, *The Vox Dei. Communication in the Middle Ages*, New York – Oxford, 1990, 98 ff., 175 ff., 260 ff.; *Le forme della propaganda politica nel due e nel trecento* (*Collection de l'école Française de Rome*, 201), (ed.) Paolo Cammarosano, Roma, 1994.

³ The Queen's charter of donation has not been preserved as an original document. It was transcribed and corroborated in another charter, issued also in the name of Queen Mary on the February 21, 1388 – MOL DL 7309. However, the original version of the document that will be discussed on this occasion was still existent in the first half of the 19th century – it was transcribed and then published in *Codex diplomaticus Hungariae ecclesiasticus et civilis* (hereafter *CDH*), (ed.) György Fejér, X/3, Budae, 1838, 312-322, nr. XL (the transcription from the original is visible through the note readable only in the originals: *Commissio propria domine regine* – p. 322, omitted in the transcription from 1388). The version from the transcription made in 1388 is published in *Codex diplomaticus regni Croatiae, Dalmatiae et Sclavoniae* (hereafter *CDC*), (ed.) Tadija Smičiklas et al., XVII, Zagreb, 1981, pp. 85-92, nr. 67. The differences between the two versions are negligible, and I will cite the version from *CDC*. On the *narration* formula in Hungarian royal charters see D. DVORÁKOVÁ, *Aspekte der Narrationes der Schenkungsurkunden Sigismunds für ungarische Adelige*, in: *Kaiser Sigismund (1368-1437): Zur Herrschaftspraxis eines europäischen Monarchen*, (ed.) Karel Hruza, Alexandra Kaar, Wien - Köln - Weimar, 2012, pp. 235-244, and J. CSÁKÓ, *Chancellerie royale et historiographie dans la Hongrie du XIV^e siècle. État des recherches*, in: *Formations et cultures des officiers et de l'entourage des princes dans les territoires Angevins* (*Collection de l'école Française de Rome*, 518/3), (ed.) Isabelle Mathieu, Jean-Michel Matz, Rome, 2019, pp. 187-208.

because it registers two separate acts. It includes first a sentence for the act of treason perpetrated by brothers de Horvathi, a *decretum* of collective deliberation of the Queen as *acting King* together with her husband Sigismund (who, according to the wording at the moment of promulgation of the *decretum*, was not yet the King, but only prince consort)⁴ and the royal council.⁵ After the sentence (*decretum*) is rendered, there follows a separate and proper act of donation, clearly marked as a different act,⁶ by which the confiscated possessions of the brothers de Horvathi were donated to Nicholas de Gara (Gorjanski), the son of the former count palatine and a close associate of the Queen Regent Elizabeth, who was killed on July 25 near Djakovo. This sequence of different acts is rendered chronologically, but the two acts have rather different formulas of *narratio*. In the sentence, the narration, rendered as the Queen's speech act, is focused on the acts of treason committed by the brothers de Horvathi. It begins with the journey of the two Queens from Buda (today Budapest) to Djakovo, provoked by the treacherous acts of the brothers de Horvathi. In this manner, the account omits the episode of the short rule of Charles of Durazzo. Hereafter it develops along the already familiar line, climaxing in the murder of the Queen Regent Elizabeth, and ending with Mary's liberation.⁷ As such, this narration constitutes the main element of the sentence, providing the reasons why it was promulgated.

In the part of the document that is a proper charter of donation, there is another, much shorter, *narratio* formula.⁸ It briefly narrates two episodes of conflict with John de Horvathi; one in the district of Chereg, and the other around the castle of Požega, in which Nicholas de Gara, who was the recipient of the donation, showed his bravery and fidelity to the royal couple. This second *narratio* is more in line with the usual way such stories were rendered. Generally, they may be considered as brief chronicles that provide an introduction to the dispositive parts of donation or privilege charters. They tell in a brief and objective manner individual stories about the deeds by which a beneficiary proved worthy of the royal donation or privilege.⁹

Seen from this perspective, the document issued in the name of Queen Mary on September 14, 1387, or at least its first part, which renders the sentence in the case of de Horvathi treason, is quite

⁴Sigismund's role during Mary's imprisonment is rendered in the text of the document in this way: *serenissimo principe domino Sigismundo, eadem gracia marchione Brandenburgensi etc. conthorale nostro karissimo Polonorum rege imperante solio et sceptro regiminis dicti regni Hungarie* (CDC, XVII, p. 88). This is quite in line with the fact that the rite of Sigismund's coronation on March 31 1386 was performed by the bishop of Veszprém (ENGEL, *op. cit.*, /n. 1/ p. 199), whose duty by default was to coronate the King's spouse (J. M. BAK, Roles and Functions of Queens in Árpadian and Angevin Hungary (1000-1386 A.D.), in: *Medieval Queenship*, (ed.) John Carmi Parsons, New York, 1998, pp. 21-22). On the other hand, Mary's role after the liberation is clearly described in this way: *suscepti regiminis officio, cum rite est* (CDC, XVII, p. 89). As Pal Engel noted "Louis's throne passed to the eleven-year-old Mary, who was crowned on 17 September 1382, the day following her father's burial" (ENGEL, *op. cit.* /n. 1/ p. 195). Although such practice was not unknown in medieval Europe it usually provoked all kinds of troubles - see R. BATLETT, *Blood Royal: Dynastic politics in Medieval Europe*, Cambridge, 2020, pp. 124-154.

⁵The procedure in which the sentence (*decretum*) was allegedly promulgated is described in this way: *Nos Maria, dei gracia regina Hungarie, Dalmacie, Croacie etc. ... una cum eodem serenissimo domino Sigismundo rege, consorte nostro carissimo, prelatisque et baronibus, militibus ac pocioribus proceribus regni nostri ... decretum subnotandum nostro in conspectu vniformiter sanctione iuris dictante proferentibus* (CDC, XVII, p. 89). For the composition and role of the royal council in the Angevin era see P. ENGEL, *Struttura sociale e politica dell'Ungheria in epoca angioina*, in: *L'Ungheria angioina*, (ed.) Enikő Csukovits, Roma, 2013, pp. 133-134.

⁶*Quibus sic legitime et condigno iuridico moderamine per ipsam regiam et nostram maiestatem ex consilio et consensu prelatorum, baronum, militum et procerum predictorum ac decreto et sanctione unanimi eorundem diffinitis et consumpmatis* (CDC, XVII, p. 90).

⁷CDC, XVII, pp. 86-89.

⁸CDC, XVII, pp. 90-91.

⁹D. DVORÁKOVÁ, *op. cit.* (n. 3) pp. 355-356; J. CSÁKÓ, *op. cit.* (n. 3), pp. 198-202.

unusual. Its *narratio* is not rendered in objective form, nor does it concern a beneficiary of the donation: instead, it tells the story from the Queen's perspective as a ruler, supplying the reasons why the possessions of the de Horvathi brothers have been confiscated. The effect produced in this way is to render the authoritative "official version" of the events that led to the classification of specific acts as "acts of treason". At first glance it seems that this was of paramount importance for both the Queen and her spouse Sigismund, as well as for those who now stood by their side. The reason why the consolidated political center¹⁰ needed a new "official" version of what transpired during the last twelve months is easy to gauge: previously, in August 1386, the prelates, barons, and nobles of the Kingdom classified the events of the July 25, 1386 differently.

This group gathered under the leadership of acting count palatine Nicholas of Szécs in August 1386 in Székesfehérvár, and formed the "league" that acted as the "Council of the Realm", with its own seal bearing the inscription SIGILLUM REGNICOLARUM REGNI HUNGARIAE. On this occasion, they even deliberated about promulgating a special decree to serve as a "peace treaty" between the warring factions.¹¹ Whether the decree was ever promulgated is still open to question, but it is clear that it circulated, and the text is preserved as an undated contemporaneous copy or even a draft of the document.¹² What is of special interest on this occasion is that on the subject of the events described here, it speaks about "the time of the recent strife and struggle of ban John, prior John of Vrana, their brothers and dependents with the late Nicholas of Gara, count palatine, and his brothers, followers, and adherents". It also clearly states:

¹⁰ It is still impossible to determine the precise timing as well as the form of the consolidation of political center, in the sense that Sigismund took over the position of *acting* King together with his spouse. After the Queen was liberated, she met her husband in Zagreb on July 4, 1387, but for the time being, she still performed the role of the official ruler. Her messengers reached the southernmost city of the kingdom, Dubrovnik, on July 19, and on that day they started negotiations about the form of pledge of loyalty due to the Queen as the city's "natural master" and to her husband (*domine nostre naturali et viro suo*). M. DINIĆ, *Odluke veća Dubrovačke republike*, II, Beograd, 1964, p. 371. The text of the pledge was finalized on July 23 (M. DINIĆ, *op. cit.*, p. 398), while the formal rite was performed on July 24. The text of the pledge is preserved in Dubrovnik archives and printed in *CDC*, XVII, pp. 74-75, nr. 57. The text clearly states that the loyalty is due Queen as "natural master", her offspring and then Sigismund only in the capacity of the Queen's spouse (*domine Marie ... domine nostre naturali ... et suis heredibus ... atque serenissimo regi Sigismundo tamquam inclito consorti*). However, the relations in the political center were changed before August 15, when the notaries in the city of Zadar changed their dating formula, substituting the name of Mary with that of Sigismund. The notary Raymond de Modiis entered under that date a special note in his register: *Die XV augusti. Hic incepit intitulari serenissimus princeps dominus Sigismundus rex Vngarie etc. et marchio Brandenburgensis etc. et dominus Stephanus Laccouich regni Vngarie comes palatinus et ciuitatis Iadre comes*; see Državni arhiv u Zadru, *Spisi zadarskih bilježnika* (hereafter: DAZd, SZB), Raymundus de Modiis, Busta I, fasciculus I, fol. 194. Another notary, Peter de Serçana, entered under the same date a similar note in his register (DAZd, SZB, Petrus de Serçana, Busta II, fasciculus 27, fol. 12 – and here it has to be noted that those two registers are the only contemporary ones preserved in the archive, although at that time at least four or five public notaries were active in the city of Zadar). This change must have been the result of the decision of the city's governing bodies, provoked by a formal notification from the political center. From all of this, it can safely be concluded that the formal act empowering Sigismund to act as the King was performed in the first days of August 1387. This interpretation is corroborated by the fact that Sigismund took a formal solemn oath to abide by the *pactum pacis* concluded between King Louis and the Venetian Republic in 1381, otherwise due from every new ruler of Hungary-Croatia, only on August 25, 1387; see the document issued on that day in *Monumenta Hungariae historica: Acta extera*, (hereafter *MHH*), (ed.) Gusztáv Wenzel, III, Budapest, 1876, pp. 646-649, nr. 372.

¹¹ On the gathering in Székesfehérvár see E. MÁLYUSZ, *op. cit.* (n. 1), pp. 22-24; P. ENGEL, *op. cit.* (n. 1), p. 198; *Online Decreta Regni Mediaevalis Hungariae. The Laws of the Medieval Kingdom of Hungary (2019). All Complete Monographs. 4.*, (ed.) János M. Bak (https://digitalcommons.usu.edu/lib_mono/4 - accessed January 3, 2020), p. 302.

¹² See *Magyar Országos Levéltár, Diplomatikai levéltár* (hereafter MOL DL or MOL DF) nr. 52575 (photographs of all the medieval documents from this archive are accessible online: <https://archives.hungaricana.hu/en/charters/>).

since the aforementioned strife arose not for the contempt or injury of the queen's majesty, but was induced and carried on because of *ancient enmities among the aforementioned parties*, the same ladies, the queens, in order that the state of the kingdom may be restored for the better, should entirely root out from their hearts anything that the aforementioned ban John and prior John of Vrana, their close relatives, retainers, and followers, may have *by chance* committed against the royal honor or that of the queen; and they should confirm this by their letters and other necessary and pertinent remedies, and they should kindly receive these men at the queen's court and should deign to honor and promote them appropriately in council and otherwise by honoring and promoting them to royal honors, which are in accordance with the preeminence of their station and birth, just as the royal majesty is wont to do with other barons and nobles of the kingdom.¹³

That this interpretation was widely distributed and accepted among the nobility, even those who composed the political center after Mary's husband Sigismund took the leading position, can be clearly discerned from the poem *Carmen de Carolo Parvo*, written by a Venetian notary and humanist Lawrence de Monacis, who in 1386/87 served as a notary to Pantaleone Barbo, the Venetian ambassador in Hungary.¹⁴ This was not the last time Lawrence went to Hungary. He would be sent there again by the Venetian government, this time alone, on a diplomatic mission in February 1389, and on this occasion was explicitly ordered to consult with barons and ecclesiastical lords.¹⁵ In this way Lawrence became the "expert" in Hungarian affairs, and was again sent there on a diplomatic mission in February 1390. This time it was calculated that he would be received in separate audiences by the King and the Queen.¹⁶ Through all of those contacts, Lawrence obviously built an informal relation with Queen Mary, which is clear from the "letter of dedication" to his poem. In it, he explains that they continued to talk even after he was officially dismissed, and that at this point, she commissioned him to put down in writing the story of what happened "in recent times" (*temporibus modernis*). The passage from the "letter of dedication" concerning this commission reads: *In urbe Zeucana injunxisti mihi ... dum me Venetorum Reip. Functum mandatis, expeditumque remitteres, ut quae ibi domi foris que temporibus sunt gesta modernis ad secla ventura scribendo transferrem.*¹⁷ The topo-

¹³ *Online Decreta...*, *op. cit.* (n. 11), pp. 304-305, nrs. 5 and 8. Possessions of the de Gara and de Horvathi clans near the township of Đakovo were close by (see F. ŠIŠIĆ, *op. cit.* /n.1/ p. 36) and it is quite understandable that "enmities" were "old" (*antiquae inimicitiae*) leading to open "strife and struggle" (*rixae et pugnae*). Members of both clans belonged to the aristocratic circle of the kingdom in the 14th century so it is quite natural that members of that social stratum knew very well what was going on between them.

¹⁴ On Lawrence de Monacis and his poem see M. POPPI, *Ricerche sulla vita e cultura del notaio e cronista veneziano Lorenzo de Monacis, cancelliere Cretese (ca. 1351-1428)*, *Studi Veneziani*, 9, Pisa – Roma, 1867, pp. 153-186; I. FERENCZI, *Poetry of Politics: Queen Mary of Hungary in Lorenzo Monaci's Carmen (1387)*, MA Thesis in Medieval Studies CEU, Budapest, 2008, pp. 7-11, 33-49. The poem is edited in *Laurentii de Monacis Veneti Crete cancellarii chronicon de rebus Venetis*, (ed.) Flaminus Cornelius, Venice, 1758, pp. 321-338. Contact with the members of Sigismund's inner circle, the political center, is visible in the report of Pantaleone Barbo's mission drawn by Lawrence for the Venetian governing bodies, submitted in April 1387. It starts with the description of talks that took part on April 7 (that was the date of Easter in 1387) in the King's gardens: *Serenissimus dominus Sigismundus rex Hungarie dixit in die pasce in viridario suo domino ambaxatori presentibus baronibus et prelatibus*; in: *Listine o odnošajih između južnoga slavenstva i Mletačke Republike*, (ed.) Šime Ljubić, IV, Zagreb, 1874, pp. 237-238, nr. 340, April 1387.

¹⁵ *Listine...*, *op. cit.* (n. 14), pp. 261-262, nr. 376, February 10, 1389. Among other duties Lawrence was ordered: *Visitabis quoque illos prelatos et barones, quibus nostras literas mittimus, si eos invenies, cum illis verbis, que tibi videbuntur, et quicquid ab eis habueris, nobis in tuo reditu particulariter declarabis.*

¹⁶ *Listine...*, *op. cit.* (n. 14), pp. 274-275, nr. 393, February 3 1390: *Laurenti! Vade ad presentiam serenissimi domini regis et excellentissime domine regine Hungarie ... quibus et utrique eorum facta cordiali salutatione.*

¹⁷ *Laurentii de Monacis, op. cit.* (n. 14), p. 323.

nym *urbs Zeucana* in the printed version of the poem was corrected by Mario Poppi, who consulted the manuscript Vaticano Latino 11507. The term *Leucana*¹⁸ that he replaced it with corresponds to the medieval royal free town of *Leuche* or modern day Levča (Lőcse in Hungarian) in Slovakia. This identification helps determine the time of commission and writing of the poem.¹⁹ Namely, there is a document issued in the name of Queen Mary in *Leuche*, dated April 28, 1389,²⁰ which gives a rough time frame for the sojourn of the Venetian ambassador. It was on this second trip to Hungary in 1389 that Lawrence crossed the Danube and on that occasion experienced some kind of shipwreck, which caused him material losses.²¹ However, it is not quite clear when and where this accident happened, because the Venetian notary had to cross the Danube twice: first in order to reach both the Queen and also King Sigismund (who at this time sojourned in southeastern parts of his Kingdom after the campaign in Serbia, far away from Levča).²² Then he had to cross the river again on his way back home when his mission was over after the sojourn in Levča. Taking into account that his mandate was written on February 10, 1389, and that he was in Levča at the end of April, it is safe to assume that Lawrence first traveled to southeastern parts around the city of Timișoara, where Sigismund spent most of April, and that he afterwards traveled some four hundred kilometers to the north in order to reach the Queen.

All of this sheds new light on the process of composing the poem – it was definitely written down after Lawrence’s return from Hungary in the spring of 1389. His talks with the Queen in Levča gave him material for writing, which can clearly be seen in the scene depicting the arrival of Charles of Durazzo in Buda,²³ or in the way he renders the reaction of the Queen and Queen Regent when they were requested to cede the crown, and when they were left to themselves with no witnesses.²⁴ However, through his praise of the Queen’s demeanor – being only sixteen, and yet capable of “sublime grasp” of worldly affairs²⁵ – Lawrence hints at the idea that the talks in Levča also defined the angle for the emplotment of his poem. Stripped of humanist embellishments and flattery, the story remains simple, and points to two main culprits on the Hungarian side: the count palatine Nicholas de Gara²⁶ and the Bishop of Zagreb, Paul de Horvathi, who leads his brothers,²⁷ quite in line with what

¹⁸ M. POPPI, *op. cit.* (n. 14), p. 170, nn. 96, 98.

¹⁹ The problem of dating the poem is tackled by M. Poppi, who concluded that Lawrence wrote the poem in 1386 and then only slightly corrected it in 1388 (M. POPPI, *op. cit.* /n. 14/, p. 170, n. 98).

²⁰ P. ENGEL – N. C. TÓTH, *Itineraria regum et reginarum Hungariae (1382-1438)*, Budapest, 2005, p. 40; the document is preserved as MOL DL nr. 7492 and the dating reads: *Datum in Leuche feria quarta proxima post festum beati Marci ewangeliste, anno domini Mmo CCCmo LXXXmo nono.*

²¹ M. Poppi cites a document from the Venetian archives dated March, 1390, stating: *in altro viaggio, al passaggio del Danubio, subi naufragio e sopportò un grave danno per i panni e le altre cose che aveva con sè.* M. POPPI, *op. cit.* (n. 14), p. 172.

²² See Sigismund’s itinerary in P. ENGEL – N. C. TÓTH, *op. cit.* (n. 20), pp. 62-63.

²³ *Laurentii de Monacis, op. cit.* (n. 14), pp. 330-331: *Ergo propinquanti Carolo solemniter ambae occurrunt, curru aurato, pompaque superba, et medium accipiunt...*

²⁴ *Laurentii de Monacis, op. cit.* (n. 14), p. 332: *Attonitas discrimine tanto exemplo aggreditur reginas nuntius acer impia jussa ferens, ut cedat nata coronae. Annuit ore parens formidine saucia mortis; dissimulare nequit, sic apta voce locuta: Nolo refutare ingeminat diadema paternum et mihi jure datum. Hungariam, permittite, linguam, exul ad expulsum conjux properabo maritum. Ast iram exhalat senior regina remotis testibus: omnipotens cur non festinate ab alto vindictam in caput ingrante praedonis, & hostis foeminei: ille sui reginas sanguinis, altis ut matres meritis venerandas, culmine sacro legitimas, solitiis didicit depellere avitis.*

²⁵ *Laurentii de Monacis, op. cit.* (n. 14), p. 313: *Obstupui, in tali aetatula; sextum enim, & decimum agebas annum; tam virilem curam, & sublimem conceptum, specimenque tam vetusti, & gloriosi sanguinis in tanta animi magnitudine recognovi.*

²⁶ *Laurentii de Monacis, op. cit.* (n. 14), p. 326: *Prima palatinus labes & causa malorum editus urbe Gara.*

²⁷ *Laurentii de Monacis, op. cit.* (n. 14), p. 327: *superat crudelia fratrum arma trium immani Paulus feritate togatus. Zagrabiæ, praesul, caput, incentorque malorum tantorum, ad facinus quodcumque paratior ipsis.*

was described in the decree of the Székesfehérvár diet. This point is reiterated again in his “letter of dedication”, with his admiration for the Queen’s courage when she was “being held prisoner by the sacrilegious hands of hostile servants and [her] kingdom was burning in the fires of war because of the *bloody quarrels of [her] subjects*”.²⁸ This same interpretation was upheld by some of the leading figures of the political center, namely count palatine Stephen Laczkfy (Lazcouich among Croatian speakers). On February 12, 1389, his chancellery produced a document in which the clash of the opposing factions was described as “a war between” two opposing sides, neither one being declared as rightful.²⁹ However, this same clash was described quite differently in a document produced by royal chancellery only one month earlier, on January 15, 1389. In it the conflict was described as rightful violent action of a royal official against the “notorious infidel”.³⁰ It is in this context that Lawrence’s decision to omit from his story the details of the imprisonment of the Queens, without even a hint about the fate of the Queen Regent, gains significance.

This omission becomes even more meaningful if we now look at the way several contemporaneous sources registered the news of Elizabeth’s death. First of all, there is the “diary-chronicle” (*memoriale*) of a Zadar patrician, politician, and lawyer Paul de Paulo.³¹ Regrettably, the “diary-chronicle” is preserved only as a “fourth-hand” transcription edited by John Lucius (Lucić), with lots of inconsistencies and errors (probably as a result of transcriptions), some of them partly corrected later and again edited by Ferdo Šišić.³² From his text it is quite clear that the patrician from Zadar had a special relationship with Queen Elizabeth, as well as a personal relationship with her daughter Queen Mary. First of all, his more or less regular entries in the “diary-chronicle” begin with the death of King Louis, and with Mary’s coronation.³³ Prior to this, his entries were sporadic, with a total of nine entries for the period between the years 1371 and 1382. He registered family affairs (birth of son), accidents in the city (fall of a house and fires), arrivals and departures of prominent persons, as well as news from the external world, with their echoes from the city. But with Elizabeth and Mary his native city and its ruling stratum, of which Paul was part, found itself drawn into high politics. On the other hand, Elizabeth herself had had a personal history with Zadar and its patriciate, starting from 1377 at the latest, when she commissioned a monumental gilded si-

²⁸ Translation of Ilona Ferenczi in I. FERENCZI, *op. cit.* (n. 14), p. 58 (italics mine – M.A.). Lawrence’s text in Latin reads: *tempore quo te sacrilegis hostilium servorum minibus intercepta, regnum tuum cruentis regnicolarum disceptationibus flagrabat bellorum incendiis.*

²⁹ *Oklevelek Temesvármegye és Temesvárváros történetéhez*, (ed.) Tivadar Ortway, Frigyes Pesty, I, 1183-1430, Pozsony, 1896, p. 169, nr. 106: *eo tempore quo videlicet domus prefati Bartholomei in Temesuar existens, in guerra inter Ladislaum filium Petri fratrem Johannis bani ac inter Ladislaum et Stephanum filios Stephani de Lochonch habita, cremata extitisset* (counteritalics mine – M.A.).

³⁰ *Oklevelek Temesvármegye, op. cit.* (n. 29), p. 163, nr. 105: *in bellico conflictu per virum magnificum dominum Ladislaum de Lossonch, regni nostri Sclauonie banum, contra eundem Ladislaum filium Petri de Horuathy nostrum notorium infidelem in Themeswar virtuose commiso* (counteritalics mine – M.A.).

³¹ On Paul de Paulo and his different social “roles”, see I. ANZULOVIC, Pavao Pavlović – istaknuti Zadranin 14. i 15. stoljeća (oko 1330.-33 – 1416.), *Zadarska smotra*, 1-2, Zadar, 1995, pp. 75-111; D. KARBIĆ – L. ČORALIĆ, Prilozi za životopis Pavla de Paulo, *Rasprave iz hrvatske kulturne prošlosti*, 1, Zagreb, 1998, pp. 63-68.

³² “Memoriale Pavli de Pavlo patritii Jadrensis” in I. LUCIUS DALMATINUS, *De regno Dalmatiae et Croatiae libri sex*, Amstelaedami, 1661, pp. 423-438. Modern edition in F. ŠIŠIĆ, *Ljetopis Pavla Pavlovića patricija zadarskog, Vjestnik kraljevskog hrvatsko-slavonsko-dalmatinskog zemaljskog arkiva*, VI, Zagreb, 1904, pp. 1-59. A definition of the genre of “diary-chronicle” has been elaborated by literary historian A. ZLATAR, *Memoriale Pauli de Paulo patritii jadrensis, Dani Hvarskega kazališta: Građa i rasprave o hrvatskoj književnosti i kazalištu* 17 (1), Split, 1991, pp. 241-250, who points out Paul’s description of his mainly public activity combined with self-centered process of writing.

³³ F. ŠIŠIĆ, *op. cit.* (n. 32), p. 5.

Iver casket for the remains of St Simeon the Prophet to be made precisely in the city.³⁴ The casket was an object of negotiations between the Queen and Zadar patricians when she, together with her daughters, visited the city in October 1383, during Paul's term as one of the three "mayors" (*rectores*) of the city. According to the agreement they reached on the subject, one of the keys of the casket (obviously there were at least two locks) was to be kept by the governing body (*regimen*) of the city, and it was precisely Paul, as the first among the three "mayors", who took that key solemnly from the royal castellan of the city citadel, as he proudly notes in his "diary-chronicle".³⁵ As far as we know, Paul never saw Elizabeth again, and what is of even more interest here is that he does not even hint about the events that transpired either in the winter of 1385 (Charles' coronation³⁶ and subsequent violent death), or in the summer of 1386 (when Elizabeth and Mary were taken prisoners). When he writes about Elizabeth's death (and I will return to the subject shortly), he simply and coldly states that she was interred (*in captivitate*) in the Novigrad citadel, without explaining how, when or by whom she was captured and imprisoned. This same way of presenting facts is repeated when Paul rendered his visit with the newly liberated Queen Mary. He writes that she was "liberated from captivity" and exited the Novigrad citadel "in the morning" of June 4, 1387. He does not reveal how she then traveled to the nearby city of Nin, but he makes sure that the day he arrived to Nin, Friday (June 7), is recorded. Continuing in the same vein, he then writes down that he "spoke" with the Queen on Saturday (June 8), and left Nin on next Monday (June 10), being formally "dismissed" by her,³⁷ which implies that he was probably there on a formal mission.

As is by now clear from what has been said, Paul did not feel the urge to concatenate into a full story the facts he recorded, nor did he give any explanations. His text is dry and coldly registers the

³⁴ Members of the Zadar patriciate, a group of five, played a crucial role in the commissioning, planning, and execution of the work on the casket, performed by goldsmith Francis from Milan. See N. JAKŠIĆ, *Od hagiografskog obrasca do političkog elaborata – škrinja Sv. Šimuna, zadarska arca d'oro*, *Ars Adriatica*, 4, Zadar, 2014, pp. 95-124, who also gives convincing interpretation of the scenes depicted on the sides of the casket. The casket became one of the symbols of the Croatian/Dalmatian medieval culture and as such was the subject of numerous papers and no less than three monographs. The one still relevant being I. PETRICIOLI, *St. Simeon's Shrine in Zadar*, Zagreb, 1983.

³⁵ Paul notes in his "diary-chronicle" that October 24, 1383, is the date when Elizabeth and her daughters arrived in Zadar; F. ŠIŠIĆ, *op. cit.* (n. 32), p. 6. He does not mention the negotiations but he notes that Elizabeth ordered the ban (viceroy) to take one of the keys of the casket; F. ŠIŠIĆ, *op. cit.* (n. 32), p. 7: *Die ultimo mensis octobris domina regina antedicta praecepit domino (Stephano) bano praedicto, ut acciperet unam clavem arcae argentae super arcam Sancti Simeonis*; F. ŠIŠIĆ, *op. cit.* (n. 32), p. 8: *Die 16. mensis novembris dominus Vladislavus, castellanus et vicarius Iadrae, praesentavit nobis pro parte dominarum reginarum antedictarum clavem arcae praedicti Sancti Simeonis, ut per regimen servaretur, et data fuit mihi Paulo de Paulo, tunc rectori, praedicta clavis, ita quod primus rector qui incoepit servare dictam clavem, mandato dominarum reginarum praedictarum, ego fui*. A very late echo of the negotiations comes from 1455 when one citizen of Zadar deposited his formal testimony remembering the advent of Elizabeth "circa 1380", when rumors spread about her intention to take away the "body of the saint" from the city. See N. JAKŠIĆ, *op. cit.* (n. 34), p. 116. Distribution of the keys would not signify the end of the affair. The following year, the Queen's representatives commissioned a special iron grille to be mounted in front of the chapel of St Simeon, where the casket and the sarcophagus with the saint's body were located; see N. JAKŠIĆ, *op. cit.* (n. 34), p. 117. Paul, however, does not write about that.

³⁶ This seems even more strange when we know that the Zadar commune wrote a letter to Queen Margaret, wife of Charles de Durazzo, with information concerning her husband's coronation. That letter reached Naples on January 21, 1386 - *Anno domini MCCCLXXXVI die dominica XXI ianuarii VIII Ind. universitas Iadare de Sclavonia scripserunt nova domine regine Margarite, quomodo rex Karolus erat coronatus in regem Ungarie, de voluntate domine regine Ungarie, et omnium prelatorum, comitum et baronum, in ora terciarum in civitate Albe regalis, ubi coronatur reges Ungarie, et ibi sePELLIUNTUR quando moriuntur. Et eodem sero facte (sic) fuerunt in civitate Neapolis magna luminaria*. See *Chronicon Siculum incerti auctoris ab anno 340 ad annum 1396*, (ed.) Giuseppe de Blasiis, Neapoli, 1887, p. 63.

³⁷ F. ŠIŠIĆ, *op. cit.* (n. 32), p. 11: *Die 4. nensis iunii de mane serenissima princeps et domina nostra naturalis, domina Maria regina Ungariae, liberate fuit a captivitate et exivit de castro Novigradi, in quo detinebatur; et die veneris sequentis ivi ad (civitatem) Nonam, et die crostino, die sabbati, locutus fui maiestati suae, et die lunae immediate recessi a Nona, licentiatu ab ea*.

facts as they come by, at best formatting them into some sort of episodes or “units of information” (in the remainder of the text I will not use quotation marks when I speak about them) regarding specific persons or protracted events. From the fact that he states the days of the week when he writes about his sojourn in the city of Nin, it seems safe to conclude that in some cases his habit was to record facts or episodes when his memory was still fresh and clear, but as we will see shortly, that was not the rule. It is no surprise then that he handled the information about Elizabeth’s death in the same inconsistent way. Here he linked together two disparate units of information only through the fact that the later one began the day after the first one ended. Paul thus formulated a unit from the information concerning the whereabouts of the Archbishop of Zadar between 1384 and 1386. He ended that unit by writing that on August 18, 1386, the Archbishop left his city to visit the nearby island of Pag, returning to Zadar on Thursday, August 20. With the new sentence Paul started writing about the fate of the Queens, opening this information unit with the fact that on August 21 (the day after the Archbishop returned from the island of Pag), the person whom he usually calls „ban“ (John de Horvathi, the former ban of Mačva) returned to Zadar. The sentence then continues in a surprising manner, making a temporal leap of five months – the same person left Zadar on January 13, 1387, only to be back on January 16. Precisely on that day, but not explicitly connected to the ban’s return, arrived the news of Elizabeth’s death.³⁸ Apart from the quite unusual temporal leap of five months in the second sentence, the dates and the days of the week in the first sentence are inconsistent – August 20, 1386, was not Thursday but Sunday. In his edition F. Šišić tried to salvage the data rendered in this messy way by dismantling Paul’s units of information and ordering the extracted facts chronologically, regardless of their original composition. So between the parts of the second sentence he interjected a good deal of text extracted from other units of information concerning the events from November 23 and 26, as well as December 10, 1386.³⁹ As is visible from this argumentation, Šišić’s edition of Paul’s “diary-chronicle” is in fact a peculiar “work of fiction”, and consequently his interpretation of the text can be used by modern historians, but only very cautiously, and with an eye on the text as it is rendered in Lucius’ edition. It is only there that we can see how Paul composed his information unit concerning the fate of the Queens.

The text rendered by Lucius but using modern orthography reads as follows:⁴⁰

Die sequenti (i.e. 21 mensis augusti) reversus est Iadram banus et die 13 ianuaris 1387 recessit, et die 16 eiusdem mensis reversus est Iadram. Eodem die hoc est 16 ianuaris applicuit novum quod domina regina senior obiit in castro Novigrad in captivitate. Die 22 februarius mensis dominus episcopus Sagrabiensis et comes Thomas frater domini prioris et bani iter arripuerunt versus Apuliam cum quibus ivit dominus Paulus de Georgiis et certi alii nobiles de Iadra et cras

³⁸ The text in Lucius’ edition runs as follows: *1386. Die 18. Aug. idem D. Archiepiscopus ivit Pagum die Martis 20. mensis post vespervas idem D. Archiep. reversus est Iadram. Die sequenti reversus est Iadram B. & die 13. Ianuar. 1387. Recessit, & die 16. ejusdem mens. Reversus est Iad. eodem die hoc est 16. Ian. applicuit novum, quod D.R. senior obiit in Castro Novigrad in captivitate*; I. LUCIUS DALMATINUS, *op. cit.* (n. 32), p. 424.

³⁹ The version of F. Šišić looks like this (F. ŠIŠIĆ, *op. cit.* /n. 32/, pp. 9-10):
1386.

...
Die 18. mensis augusti idem dominus archiepiscopus ivit Pagum. Die martis 21. Mensis (augusti) post vespervas, idem dominus archiepiscopus reversus est Iadram.

Die sequenti (22. mensis augusti) reversus est Iadram banus.

Die 23. mensis novembris ...

Die 26. mensis novembris ...

Die lunae 10. mensis decembris ...

1387.

Die 13. mensis ianuarii recessit (banus) et die 16. eisudem mensis reversus est Iadram. Eodem die, hoc est 16. mensis ianuarii, applicuit novum, quod domina regina senior obiit in castro Novigradi in captivitate.

⁴⁰ I. LUCIUS DALMATINUS, *op. cit.* (n. 32), p. 424.

die sequenti recessit versus Chroatiam dominus Iohannes banus. 1387 die sabbati 9 februaris fertur quod corpus praedictae dominae reginae fuit portatum Iadram et repositum in monasterio sancti Grisogonis. Eodem anno die 5 martii hora tertiarum fuit in Iadra terraemotus magnus. 1387 die 4 mensis iunii de mane serenissima princeps et domina nostra naturalis domina Maria regina Vngariae liberata fuit a captivitate et exivit de castro Novigrad in quo detinebatur, et die veneris sequentis ivi ad eam Nonam et die crastina die sabbathi locutus fui maiestati suae, et die lunae immediate recessi a Nona licentiatu ab ea. Postea die sabbathi inde sequenti die scilicet 15 praedicti mensis recessit a Nona cum galeis Venetorum et applicuit Segniam cras die dominico, unde recessit die lunae prima iulii et die iovis in nomine sanctae Trinitatis conjunxit se cum rege illustre consorte ejus.

This makes it easier to see what was worth Paul's attention and how he composed this unit of information:

1. Ban John de Horvathi returned from his journey to Zadar on August 21, 1386. It is safe to assume that John probably went to Ancona, carrying the heads of Nicholas de Gara, de Gara's nephew, and Blasé Forgach, who were beheaded on July 25 near Djakovo. He also brought the royal flag taken from the carriage of the two Queens. It seems that from Ancona he sent two messengers to deliver the heads, the flag, and his letter to the governing body of the city of Florence.⁴¹
2. At the beginning of 1387 John de Horvathi was in Zadar again (or still – at this point it is irrelevant), and he left the city on January 13, only to return on January 16. With him “arrived” the news that Elizabeth *had died*. The only way to explain this is to assume that he rode to Novigrad, probably with an intent to go somewhere else, but was surprised by the death of the Queen Regent so that he had to go back and bring the news to his associates (but not to the general public). Paul de Paulo was not a member of John's circle, but other patricians were (see nr. 3), and it is in this indirect way (*applicuit novum*) that Paul de Paulo became aware of the news.
3. Members of the circle of John de Horvathi, his brother, the Bishop of Zagreb, Paul, and the brother of Prior John de Palissna, Thomas, left Zadar on February 22, 1387, with an intention to go to Naples. Their trip was obviously connected to the fact that the Queen Regent had died a month before that. A member of their entourage was Paul de Georgiis, one of the leaders of Zadar's patricians,⁴² together with some others whom Paul did not mention by name. John de Horvathi,⁴³ on the other hand, left the city the following day, heading towards “Croatia”

⁴¹ The content of John's letter are rendered by Florentine chronicler Naddo de Montecatini: *alli 25 d'Agosto detto per due Ungheri mandati per lo detto Giambano ed altri gentiluomini il detto stendardo tolto dalla carretta predetta e le dette tre teste giunsono in Firenze mandate alli signori priori con lettere a loro ed alli capitani delle parti; le quali lettere significavano la detta sconfitta, presura e morte per loro fatta per vendetta della morte del giusto sangue re Carlo e che rea Margherita(!?) del suo padre tenevano ad hanno con gran guardia: della vecchia non dice la lettera che fatto ne hanno. Poi dice che mandano il detto stendardo e teste quà a chiarezza della detta vendetta e del mandarle a Napoli ella reina, donna che fu del re Carlo, se piace alli signori priori, e se a loro non piace non si mandino. Chronicle Fiorentina di ser Naddo da Montecatini e del cavaliere Iacopo Salviati (Delizie degli eruditi toscani XVIII), (ed.) Ildefonso di San Luigi, Firenze, 1784, p. 87. Florentines decided to send the heads to Naples and they were there before September 16, 1386 – on that day they were paraded on the streets of the city on a small cart pulled by a donkey: *Delata fuerunt Neapolim tria capita Ungarorum, et asserebatur esse capita magni comitis Ungarie, et Fulcarii Balasii qui percussit regem, et tercius vocabatur Care senese (sic), et portate (sic) fuerunt cum quadam carreptam per civitatem Neapolis cum quodam somerio, et postea fuerunt posita in foro Neapolis. Chronicon Siculum, op. cit. (n. 36), p. 65. On all of this see also A. CUTOLO, Re Ladislao d'Angiò-Durazzo I, Napoli, 1936, pp. 65-67.**

⁴² Paul de Georgiis was one of the five patricians, always the first one to be mentioned, who oversaw the making of the St Simeon casket commissioned by Elizabeth in 1377. N. JAKŠIĆ, *op. cit.* (n. 34), p. 118.

⁴³ In Paul's text *Iohannes banus* is always John de Horvathi, while his namesake John de Palissna is differentiated with the title *prior et banus*.

(here it clearly means hinterland of the city), probably resuming whatever it was that was disturbed by Elizabeth's death. All this goes to prove that the de Horvathi – de Palissna faction had a strong basis and backing in the city, which makes Zadar the real center of their activity.

4. Somebody revealed (*fertur*) to Paul de Paulo that the body of the Queen Regent was brought to Zadar on February 9, 1387, and interred in the monastery of St. Grisogonus – which corroborates the notion that the death of the Queen Regent was kept as a secret (the fact did not become public before the last days of February, 1387).

5. Queen Mary was liberated and *exited* (*exivit*) the citadel in Novigrad, where she was held in captivity, on the morning of June 4, 1387 (Thursday). Paul traveled to the city of Nin on Friday (June 7), and was received in audience by the Queen on the following day, Saturday (June 8), only to be formally dismissed on Monday (June 10).⁴⁴ He was obviously there in an official capacity, but it remains unclear whether there were any unofficial talks, although it seems very probable because he stayed in Nin for two more days.

6. Queen Mary left the city of Nin on following Saturday, June 15,⁴⁵ aboard one of Venetian ships (*galeis*), and it is here that Venetian ships are mentioned for the first time (she exited from imprisonment eleven days earlier). The next day she arrived to the city of Senj, where she stayed until Monday, July 1,⁴⁶ when she left to join her husband on Tuesday (July 4, probably in Zagreb).⁴⁷

Seen in this way, Paul's text reveals a lot. First of all, it makes it clear that in the summer of 1386, the city of Zadar was already the main hub of the entire de Horvathi – de Palissna enterprise. There, they had found powerful city patricians sympathetic to their cause (the case of Paul de Georgiis). What is even more deserving of attention on this occasion is that de Horvathi and de Palissna tried to conceal the Queen Regent's death that occurred between January 13 and 16, 1387. They even secretly brought her body to the city and interred it in the monastery, which was under patrician patronage and control, keeping it a secret so successfully that even Paul de Paulo as one of the important persons of the governing stratum did not know about it (he was obviously not there on the occasion, otherwise he would not have used the formulation *fertur* meaning "being told"). Finally, there are two more things of utmost importance here. We must start from the conclusion that the whole unit of information that Paul composed was definitely written down after Queen Mary met her husband at the beginning of July 1387, which means subsequently to speaking with her directly in the city of Nin. The text, however, does not even hint to the idea that violence had been involved in the death of Elizabeth, nor is there any mention of Venetians when he writes about Mary's release from prison. Finally, in Paul's text there is no word or hint about the eventual military clash resulting in her release – apparently, she simply *exited* prison on Monday morning!

However, ten years later Paul was again in a situation to write about the death of the Queen Regent Elizabeth. This happened on the occasion of Sigismund's return from Constantinople, where he found refuge after the catastrophe in battle with Turks at Nicopolis on September 25, 1386. It can

⁴⁴ The dates and days of the week come from Paul's text, while the explanations in parentheses are mine.

⁴⁵ Queen Mary was still in the city of Nin on June 13, 1387, and on that day, the charter of privilege for newly appointed royal admiral and count of the islands of Hvar, Brač, and Korčula, a Zadar patrician Jacob de Cesamis, was issued in her name. He was able to present the charter before the Zadar notary on the same day – *vt patet patentibus litteris serenissime principis et domine nostre domine Marie dei gratia regine Vngarie, Dalmatie, Croatie etc. datis Nove sub impressione sui sigilli M CCC LXXXVII indicione X, die XIII iunii*; see DAZd, SZB, Raymundus de Modiis, Busta I, Fasciculus I, fol. 187-187', June 13, 1387.

⁴⁶ On June 22, 1387, a charter of donation for the Cannon of the Zagreb chapter, Gregory de Rawen, was issued in the Queen's name in Senj. CDC, XVII, pp. 70-71, nr. 52.

⁴⁷ Paul's dates and chronology are here watertight and without flaw, which means that he had written down all the data shortly afterwards.

be assumed that Sigismund's renewed interest in the circumstances surrounding the death of Queen Elizabeth was awoken during his return trip from Constantinople. This is clear even from Paul's text, or rather from his unit of information dedicated to the relations of the King to his city, which chronologically covered the period from January 1396 to February 1397.⁴⁸ Although Paul does not state it plainly, it is provable beyond any doubt that Sigismund sailed back from Constantinople at least part of the way on the galley provided by the commune of Zadar. That galley was prepared for the King's expedition against the Turks, and it left Zadar heading east in July 1396.⁴⁹ It is hard to tell whether the galley was on the mouth of the Danube at the time of the catastrophe at Nicopolis or if it stayed in Constantinople, but it was definitely not prepared to host the King and his entourage.⁵⁰ Nevertheless, after the ship was replenished with luxury items, the King sailed from Constantinople with the escort of three Venetian galleys,⁵¹ only to leave the Zadar galley behind in the Venetian port of Modon (modern day Methoni in Peloponnese, Greece). Namely, the Venetian dispatches register the arrival of that ship in Modon, but when the King arrived in Dubrovnik on December 22, 1396, only Venetian galleys are mentioned.⁵² This in turn explains why the Zadar galley arrived at home port as late as February 27, 1397.

That something was "wrong" with Zadar in the King's perception at the time he entered the Adriatic becomes visible if the final leg of his return trip is considered: he visited Dubrovnik and Split, but bypassed Zadar, obviously on purpose, only to disembark in the port of Nin some 20 kilometers to the north of Zadar.⁵³ From Nin he rode to the city of Knin and from there summoned

⁴⁸ Although entries in his "diary" for those years are chronologically much more consistent and episodes have the contours of a story, Paul never acquired the ability to concatenate them in a consequential manner; see the text in I. LUCIUS DALMATINUS, *op. cit.* (n. 32), pp. 429-430. The sequence of the episodes that Paul narrates goes like this: resolution of the conflict between the commune of Zadar and inhabitants of the island of Pag by the royal commission; details on the departure and arrival of the galley that went east in the King's service; participation of the Zadar nobles in the resolution of territorial conflict between the commune of Split and the royal fortress of Klis; beginning of ecclesiastical indulgence connected with the remains of St Simeon the Prophet; resolution of the conflict between the city's political factions; royal investigation concerning the circumstances of Elizabeth's death and the de Horvathi – de Palissna mutiny; murder of the former count palatine Stephen Lackfi; royal seizure of the possessions of some Zadar nobles.

⁴⁹ Departure of the Zadar galley on July 26, 1386, heading toward eastern Mediterranean "in the King's service" (*causa eundi ad partes orientales ad servitium domini nostri regis*), is duly noted by Paul de Paulo, who provides even the names of important figures onboard as well as the date of the return of the ship to Zadar, February 27, 1397; see his original entry in I. LUCIUS DALMATINUS, *op. cit.* (n. 32), p. 428. Although the entry was in its present form written sometime after the fact (it starts with words *Die 20 mensis iulii proxime sequenti*) it is clear that the Zadar patrician had had some notes before him and was able to report exact timing of the departure ("early in the morning" – *in crepusculo noctis*).

⁵⁰ This can be deduced from the fact that the captain of the ship, John de Soppe, and the ambassador of the commune, Raphael de Sorba, also named as such by Paul de Paulo, were forced to replenish the ship in Constantinople with the "textiles, biscuit, wine, meet, and other things", worth quite a large sum of 250 ducats, bought on credit from Genoese merchants in Pera. The debt was repaid by the Zadar commune on May 14, 1398; see DAZd, SZB, Articutus de Rivignano, Busta II, Fasciculus VII, fol. 40v-41.

⁵¹ On this see the Venetian dispatches from December 16 and 27, 1396, in *Listine, op. cit.* (n. 14), p. 393, nr. 541; p. 394, nr. 543.

⁵² See N. LONZA, *Odluke dubrovačkih vijeća 1395-1397*, Zagreb – Dubrovnik, 2011, p. 265.

⁵³ Disembarking point of the King's return trip is stated in his final ruling in the case of commune of Zadar vs. islanders of Pag issued on February 25, 1397 (CDC, XVIII, pp. 189-194, nr. 130; here p. 190: *nobis anno imminente ad Dalmacie et Croacie regnorum nostrorum predictorum climata presertim Nonam et extremo Tininum ciuitates nostras regales accedentibus*), while stopovers at Dubrovnik and Split are registered in minutes of Dubrovnik governing councils (N. LONZA, *op. cit.* /n. 52/, pp. 265 ff.) as well as in the King's letter dated Januar 4, 1397, in Split; see *Listine, op. cit.* (n. 14), p. 395, nr. 543.

Zadar nobles to come before him, to answer the charges regarding what happened ten years ago.⁵⁴ Paul de Paulo simply registers Sigismund's accusations and demands – the King wanted those among the Zadar nobility “who were responsible for or participated in the death of the late lady Elizabeth, his mother-in-law, and those who wanted to introduce the alien rule in Dalmatia, as well as those who took part in what John de Palisna, former prior in Vrana, and ban John had done”.⁵⁵ The case was to be adjudged by the bishop of Senj, Leonard, and in order to fulfill his request he ordered ten of the most prominent Zadar noblemen together with three specifically named members of the clan of de Grisogonis to appear in Knin. Paul does not tell how the ten “most prominent nobles” (*potiores nobiles*) were selected, but he gives the names of all of them. They really arrived in Knin, together with three of de Grisogonis, as well as Paul himself who was also ordered to appear before the King. Although Paul does not say it explicitly, it is clear that none of those who appeared in Knin were found guilty of the charges and they all returned safely to Zadar. Also, Paul does not write it explicitly but it is obvious that the charges brought out by the King had some foundations. It becomes clear when he renders the information about the royal seizure of the possessions of the brothers de Matafaris, “royal knights” Guido and Louis as well as the third brother Peter, the archbishop of Zadar, and Jacob de Raduchis (*legum doctor*).⁵⁶ In hindsight it can be inferred that they in fact were the real target of the King's action, but it seems that they were informed what to expect and fled the city in time. In this way it was impossible to include them among those “most prominent” who appeared before the King in Knin. Realizing that the main culprits, as far as he was concerned, slipped through his “net”, Sigismund issued, on February 3, 1397, a written formal order for the confiscation of all the property of the brothers de Matafaris, as well as the property of Jacob de Raduchis, and he left Knin three days later.

In order to ascertain the reality behind Sigismund's accusations with the meager sources at our disposal and with the idea to shed some new light on Paul's information covering the first six months of 1387, the only possible way is to compile the list of the city's “mayors” (*rectores*) who served between July, 1386, and July, 1387, and to then see whether and in what way it corresponds with the names of those who were accused of treason. In this period the office of “mayors”, held by three at any given time, was the highest in the commune, and was held for two months. That means that for the designated period we have six turns and, at least theoretically, 18 persons who served in that capacity. However, when the full list is compiled it becomes clear that there were three persons who served more than one term during this period,⁵⁷ and it was Jacob de Raduchis who held the record among them with three terms served. Among those who served more than one term is also Mauro

⁵⁴ The “Knin episode” is rendered by Paul as rounded-off story; see I. LUCIUS DALMATINUS, *op. cit.* (n. 32), p. 429, and also F. ŠIŠIĆ, *op. cit.* (n. 32), pp. 22-23: *Die 12 ianuarii applicuerunt Iadram ... die martis 6 mensis februarii recessit dominus rex et ivit ad Comichium.*

⁵⁵ The text in Šišić's orthography reads as follows: *omnes culpabiles seu participes mortis quondam dominae Elizabeth suae socrus, et eos qui alium dominium introducere in Dalmatia (voluerint), et eos qui participati sunt cum Ioanne Ioannis de Palisna, olim priore in Vrana, et cum Ioanne bano*; see F. ŠIŠIĆ, *op. cit.* (n. 32), p. 22.

⁵⁶ I. LUCIUS DALMATINUS, *op. cit.* (n. 32), p. 429: *Die iovis 22 februarii venerunt Iadram ... dederunt eis facultatem eodem die intromittendi ea juxta regium mandatum etc.* This in fact forms the last episode from Paul's information unit concerning the relations of the city and the King in 1396/97.

⁵⁷ The list is compiled on the basis of the following documents: for the term of August – September, 1386, DAZd, SZB, Articutus de Rivignano, Busta V, Fasciculus 1, fol. 11, August 22, 1386; for the term of October-November 1386, DAZd, SZB, Articutus de Rivignano, Busta V, Fasciculus 1, fol. 17v, October 21, 1386; for the term December, 1386 – January, 1387, DAZd, SZB, Articutus de Rivignano, Busta V, Fasciculus 3, fol. 30, January 20, 1387; for the term February – March, 1387, DAZd, SZB, Articutus de Rivignano, Busta V, Fasciculus 1, fol. 20v, March 21, 1387; for the term April – May, 1387, DAZd, SZB, Articutus de Rivignano, Busta V, Fasciculus 1, fol. 23v, April 24, 1387; for the term June – July, 1387, DAZd, SZB, Articutus de Rivignano, Busta V, Fasciculus 4, fol. 31v, June 6, 1387.

de Grisogonis with two terms, and he was one of three members of the de Grisogonis clan who were summoned before the King in 1397 (the other de Grisogonis summoned to Knin were Andrew, who served one term as “mayor”, and Doymus who did not serve as “mayor” during this period). Also of interest in this context are three “mayors” who served their term in August 1386, when ban John de Horvathi arrived in Zadar and was received there after sending the heads of his enemies to Florence. Those “mayors” were Paul de Georgiis (the same person whom Paul de Paulo explicitly named as one of the Zadar nobles who participated in the delegation that traveled to Naples in February 1387), Jacob de Raduchis and Louis de Matafaris. Jacob de Raduchis was also one of the “mayors” in January 1387, when Elizabeth died, while Guido de Matafaris was one of the “mayors” in February when the aforementioned delegation was dispatched. All of this clearly points to the conclusion that there really was a network of powerful Zadar nobles from the clans of de Matafaris, de Georgiis, de Grisogonis, and lone Jacob de Raduchis (born in the city of Senj, he was aggregated into Zadar nobility after returning from studies in Italy) who during this period closely cooperated with the members of the de Horvathi – de Palissna faction. However, there is one puzzling detail in all of this, and that is the fact that the King accused the de Matafaris brothers, Jacob de Raduchis and some members of the de Grisogonis clan but omitted Paul de Georgiis, one of the most prominent nobles from this period, who was otherwise deeply engaged in politics of his commune as well as those of the kingdom.⁵⁸ The reason for this can only be inferred if we take into account that his first cousin Philip, at this time a “royal admiral”, was one of the two nobles who accompanied Sigismund during his return trip from Constantinople. The second patrician was Raphael de Sorba, already mentioned as communal ambassador aboard the galley.⁵⁹ They were obviously Sigismund’s source of information, when after ten years he reopened the question of his mother-in-law’s death, and the alleged treasonous acts of Zadar nobles. Whether in addressing the Zadar council his messengers used in their speech a neutral term “death” (*mors*) or spoke about the “murder” (*nex*) of the Regent Queen, as was the case in Mary’s charter from the September 14, 1387, is hard to tell, but Paul was explicit, and by using the word “death” simply reiterated what he had written down ten years earlier.

Going back to Paul’s text now, it has to be pointed out that some of the elements forming the rudimentary story behind Paul’s unit of information are verifiable through other documents. The secrecy around Elizabeth’s death is corroborated by the fact that the news about it reached Dubrovnik as late as the first day of March. The city’s government (*Consilium Rogatorum*) deliberated on that day about a memorial Mass for the “senior Queen who died and was interred in Zadar”, and on March 2, the executive council (*Minor Consilium*) elected three patricians who were charged as

⁵⁸ For the prosopographic information on Paul de Georgiis see B. GRBAVAC, Zadarski plemići kao kraljevski vitezovi u doba Ludovika I. Anžuvinca, *Acta Histriae*, 16, Koper, 2008, pp. 94-95. For the “family tree” of the de Georgiis clan see S. DOKOZA – M. ANDREIS, *Zadarsko plemstvo u srednjem vijeku (rodoslovlja)*, Zadar, 2020, pp. 281-282.

⁵⁹ For the few facts regarding Raphael de Sorba gathered from relevant sources see B. GRBAVAC, Prilog proučavanju životopisa đenvoškog i zadarskog plemića Baltazara de Sorbe, kraljevskog admirala, in: *Humanitas et litterae: Zbornik u cast Franje Šanjeka*, (ed.) Lovorka Čoralić, Slavko Slišković, Zagreb, 2009, pp. 231-232, who wrongly concluded that Raphael was killed at Nicopolis. In fact he had a career in royal service with middling posts such as a count in the cities of Split, Šibenik, and Rab (*Arbe*) in accordance with his title of “royal knight” (*regius miles*). He was also very active in communal politics serving as *rector* on numerous occasions starting as far as our sources go in 1375, when he was already a “royal knight” (Arhiv HAZU, LUCIUS, XX-12/XVIII, p. 105, April 4, 1375). His other known rectorial terms are from February-March 1388 (DAZd, SZB, Articutus de Rivignano, Busta IV, Fasciculus 4, fol. 153, February 24, 1388), February-March 1391 (DAZd, SZB, Articutus de Rivignano, Busta V, Fasciculus 1, fol. 113v, February 19, 1391) and August-September of the same year (DAZd, SZB, Articutus de Rivignano, Busta 2, Fasciculus 7, fol. 58v-60v, October 10, 1398). Obviously, he did not serve in that capacity in 1386/87, during the crisis provoked by the imprisonment of the Queens. It is also quite clear that he was not killed at Nicopolis because it was his Genoese background that enabled him and the captain of the communal galley to obtain credit from Genoese merchants in Pera (see here note 50).

officials in that matter.⁶⁰ If we now take into account that the news about Queen Mary's liberation on June 4, 1387, needed four days to reach Dubrovnik,⁶¹ it is safe to assume that the facts regarding Elizabeth's fate became publicly known in Zadar on February 25, 1387, corroborating in this way Paul's chronological scheme (January 13 – 16, news of the death – February 22, departure of Bishop Paul – c. February 25, public knowledge about the death and details of interment). Needless to say here that the news disseminated along the eastern Adriatic coast about the death of the Queen Regent ("senior Queen") spoke about her "death" and not her "murder"! On the other hand, it remains a mystery how it was possible for Elizabeth's death to still remain unknown at Sigismund's court as late as the Easter of that year (April 7, 1387), almost a month and half after it became publicly known in Zadar – the report on the mission of the Venetian ambassador Pantaleone Barbom, written down by his notary/secretary Lawrence de Monacis, states that the ambassador talked with Sigismund on the day of Easter and that he told the ambassador that according to his information Elizabeth was probably still alive.⁶² The news about Elizabeth's death must have reached Venice at roughly the same time as it reached Dubrovnik, and from there it was easy to relay it even to the court at Buda. At this time Zadar, on the other hand, had a substantial contingent of Florentine merchants, who formed a tightly knit network, stretching from Florence through Zadar, Senj, and Zagreb, all the way to Buda.⁶³ The importance of this network for circulation of news becomes quite clear when we see from the already cited chronicle of Naddo de Montecatini that the news needed some twenty days or less to travel from Hungary to Florence. The news about the coronation of Charles of Durazzo on December 31, 1385, arrived in Florence on January 19, 1386.⁶⁴ A letter from the Florentine merchants residing in the city of Buda, containing details about the attack on Charles, was written on February 14, 1386, and arrived at Florence on March 7, 1386.⁶⁵ Finally, a letter written by the Florentine merchants "residing in Hungary" (*mercantanti Fiorentini i quali stanno in Ungheria* – judging by the dates, this could also mean those who resided in some of the cities on the eastern Adriatic shore, maybe Zadar or Senj), containing a detailed description of what transpired near Djakovo on July 24, 1386 (*recto*: July 25), arrived in Florence on August 8.⁶⁶

⁶⁰ M. DINIĆ, *op. cit.* (n. 10), p. 392, March 1, 1387: (*Consilium Rogatorum*) *Prima pars de faciendo exequias pro domina regina antiqua Vngarie viam universe carnis ingressa et Jadre sepulta. Captum per omnes*; 354, March 2, 1387: (*Minor Consilium*) *Ser Lampre de Zrieua, ser Andreas de Volgo, ser Marinus de Chaboga facti fuerunt officiales super exequiis domine nostre domine regine Vngarie viam universe carnis ingresse, Jadre inhumate, que fuit consors domini regis Ludouici.*

⁶¹ For the news on Mary's liberation see M. DINIĆ, *op. cit.* (n. 10), pp. 296-297.

⁶² *Listine, op. cit.* /n. 14/, p. 237, nr 340.

⁶³ This network is easily discernible through the results of research obtained by Antonio Teja, Tomislav Raukar, Neven Budak, Martin Štefánik, and Katalin Prajda (A. TEJA, *Aspetti della vita economica di Zara dal 1289 al 1409: Parte I. La Pratica Bancaria*, Zara, 1936; T. RAUKAR, I fiorentini in Dalmazia nel secolo XIV, *Archivio storico Italiano* 153(4), 1995, 657-680; N. BUDAK, I fiorentini nella Slavonia e nella Croazia nei secoli XIV e XV, *Archivio storico Italiano* 153(4), 1995, 681-695; M. ŠTEFÁNIK, Italian Involvement in Metal Mining in the Central Slovakian Region, from the Thirteenth Century to the Reign of King Sigismund of Hungary, *I Tatti Studies in the Italian Renaissance* 14/15, 2011, 11-46; IDEM, Die Dalmatische Route als Transportweg slowakischer Metalle in den Mittelmeerraum im 13.-14. Jahrhundert, in: *Slovakia and Croatia* vol. 1, (ed.) Martin Homza, Ján Lukačka, Neven Budak, Bratislava – Zagreb, 2013, 414-418; K. PRAJDA, *Network and Migration in Early Renaissance Florence, 1378-1433: Friends of Friends in the Kingdom of Hungary*, Amsterdam, 2018). Tens upon tens of unused and unpublished notarial deeds drawn up by Zadar notaries up to the first decade of the 15th century provide reach source material that sheds further light on this network.

⁶⁴ *Chronice Fiorentine, op. cit.* (n. 41), p. 81.

⁶⁵ *Chronice Fiorentine, op. cit.* (n. 41), p. 83.

⁶⁶ *Chronice Fiorentine, op. cit.* (n. 41), p. 86. Accurate and timely information regarding political situation was of vital significance for the smooth running of large-scale business ventures covering different and complex political units ("states"). This provides context for understanding why the East-central European network of Florentine merchants served as a unit for gathering and distribution of news.

Be that as it may, in the next ten days Sigismund's court became assured of Elizabeth's death. So as far as is known, she was proclaimed dead for the first time in the charter issued in King's name on April 17, 1387.⁶⁷ Over the course of the following month, the death of the Queen Regent morphed into a story about her murder, becoming known as a crime perpetrated by the brothers de Horvathi. This transformation is revealed in the charter of donation concerning confiscated possessions of the brothers de Horvathi issued on May 17, 1387,⁶⁸ days before the release of Queen Mary, the presumed witness of that act. What is of importance here is the fact that the violent death of Queen Mary's mother isn't mentioned in the charter of donation issued in her name on July 7, 1387 in Zagreb, for the brothers George, Stephen, and Andrew, royal treasurers and sons of *magister* Jakch de Kusal. Their brother Dionysus was also a royal treasurer, killed in the battle on June 25, 1386, near Djakovo, and the act of donation compensated the loss to the brothers de Kusal. It was a proper occasion to describe in the *narratio* of the charter what transpired in the battle and what the consequences were. In this context the text mentioned the attack on the royal entourage by John de Horvathi and John de Palissna, detailing the capture and imprisonment of the Queens, the capture of the royal treasury, the capture, imprisonment and murder of the barons, as well as bravery of the deceased Dionysus, but not even a hint appears on the murder of the Queen Regent.⁶⁹ To fully understand the difference between this and the charter issued on September 14, it must be emphasized that the charter of donation for the brothers de Kusal was issued while Mary was still the *acting king*, while the other one was issued in her name but under different circumstances, as she was by that point already being pushed into background through the interventions of the head of the royal chancellery, the (elected) archbishop of Esztergom, John de Kanizsai.⁷⁰

By now it should be clear that the differences in the accounts under discussion here, namely whether the Queen Regent was murdered in captivity, or if she died of natural causes, reflect the

⁶⁷ The charter is preserved as transcript in MOL DL 7253, and it speaks about services rendered *serenissimis principibus dominis Lodouico regi patri demumque dominabus Elizabeth matri beatorum recordacionum et Marie reginis Hungarie consorti nostris carissimis* (inverted italics are mine – M.A.).

⁶⁸ The charter of donation is preserved as transcript in MOL DF 236510. In it the King donates *quasdam possessiones Pauli condam episcopi Zagrabiensis necnon Iohannis bani et Ladislai filiorum Petri filii Pauli de Horuaty nostrorum sczilizet infidelium ... in comitatu Symigiensem habitas ad manusque nostras regias propter pretaxatam ipsorum notoriam infidelitatem et publica iudicibilia facinora et pleraque ingencia crimina que iidem dolosa perfidia ... contra ipsum sacrum regni dyadema et nostram maiestatem temerarie procedendo contumaciter perpetrasse perhibentur potissime ex eo quia iidem filii Petri non verentes ad indelendam ipsorum infamiam peiora committere prioribus pefatam serenissimam principem dominam Elizabeth reginam dicti regni Hungarie matrem nostram karissimam in eorum captiuitate proh dolor iugulare et in exilium redigi procurarunt* (inverted italics are mine – M.A.).

⁶⁹ The charter of donation is preserved as transcript in another charter issued in Mary's name on June 23, 1388 – MOL DF nr. 254817. The part of the *narratio* relevant here reads: *cum felici interitu et laudabili nece condam Dyonisii fratris ipsorum carnalis qui nuper in hostile valido conflictu et agressu vtriusque Iohannis condam bani scilicet et prioris nostrorum infidelium cum eorum fallerata et scelerata ingenti caterua aduersus ipsius gentricis nostre et nostram maiestatorum in detencionem personarum nostrarum et alienacionem thesauri reginalis non sine quorundam baronum militum et pociorum procerum nostrorum fidelium decolacione, interempcione et detencione ac variorum rerum immense quantitates ablacione per ipsos nostros infideles pro tunc temerarie perpetratis et commissis contra eosdem vtrosque Iohannem et ipsorum armigeram choortem fidelitatis furore instinctas et leonine audacia suffultus pro ipsius illustris gentricis nostre precare et nostri honoris valido incremento viriliter bellando et diucius cum eisdem strennua agilitate nobis limpidus cernentibus dimicando in area ipsius certaminis gladiis ipsorum infidelium transfixus occubuit*. It is worth noting that the brothers de Kusal received the charter of donation for the same possession earlier on, issued in the name of Sigismund on April 19, 1387 (MOL DF nr. 254812), but it is not mentioned in the Queen's charter.

⁷⁰ On the role of the (elected) archbishop (he received papal confirmation on October 9, 1387) John de Kanizsai in Sigismund's promotion to the forefront of the political center see E. MÁLYUSZ, *op. cit.* (n. 1), p. 35.

tensions in the fabric of the political center, and points to the dissent between factions, dissent that is not easily visible in the extant sources. The fact that Sigismund got his position with the consent of the baronial “league” (*liga*) that took over the administration of the kingdom when the Queens were captured in July, 1386, barely conceals the contention between the members of that “league”, which was articulated as a question about legitimacy. Two opposite factions are best represented by two most visible members of the “league” who were holders of two most prestigious positions in the royal administration – Stephen Lackfi the count palatine and John de Kanizsai, the archbishop of Eszergom and head of the royal chancellery (*summus cancellarius*). Stephen Lackfi openly defied the King on various issues,⁷¹ and as was shown earlier, stubbornly persisted on the position that defined the clash between the de Gara and de Horvathi clans as a “private war”. Here it has to be noted that in 1385 Lackfi was one of the most prominent figures in the “league” that opposed the rule of the Queens and count palatine Nicholas de Gara.⁷² As such he surely had a voice in formulating the decree from August 1386, and that probably paved the way for his promotion to the office of count palatine. It is worth noting in this context that he did not use his position in order to acquire any of the possessions confiscated from members of the de Horvathi – de Palissna faction.⁷³

At the same time John de Kanizsai stood firmly by Sigismund and proved to be the main pillar of his success, which opened an opportunity for him and his brothers to get hold of the enormous confiscated possessions.⁷⁴ From the start, the young King showed appreciation for de Kanizsai’s rhetorical capabilities and power of persuasion, and this forms the background for the decision to give him the position of the head of the royal chancellery. A curious testament to the power of his rhetorical skills is preserved in the charter of donation for the archbishop and his brothers formally issued on May 7, 1388, in Sigismund’s name by his royal chancellery. As is customary, there is in it the formula of *narratio*, which spells out the story that explicitly mentions political factions, and the way the archbishop handled discontent of the members of royal council whose thinking was channeled by the arguments of the opposite faction – simply by his skilled rhetoric he was able to “turn discord into unity”.⁷⁵ It is curious that the charter was written in royal chancellery, creating an impression that it used the King’s own words, while at the same time clearly pointing to the head of the chancellery as its author in wording and style. Simply put, the archbishop would today be called a “PR wizard”, and one of his great PR feats was the story about “treason” of the former count palatine and presumed head of the opposing political faction,

⁷¹ On Lackfi’s defiance see E. MÁLYUSZ, *op. cit.* (n. 1), p. 45.

⁷² In the document issued by the members of the league on May 16, 1385 (*CDC*, XVI, pp. 521-522, nr. 404), Stephen’s name is the second one, behind the name of the Zagreb bishop, Paul de Horvathi. In the document issued on the same day by the then count palatine Nicholas de Gara Stephen’s name was third, after the names of the Zagreb bishop and former royal judge Nicholas de Zeech. M. ANČIĆ, *Putanja klatna: Ugarsko-hrvatsko kraljevstvo i Bosna u XIV. stoljeću*, Zagreb – Mostar, 1997, pp. 265-266, nr. 8.

⁷³ E. MÁLYUSZ, *op. cit.* (n. 1), p. 31.

⁷⁴ On this see E. MÁLYUSZ, *op. cit.* (n. 1), pp. 30 ff.

⁷⁵ *CDH* X/1, p. 422, nr. CCXXXIX, May 14, 1388: *cum nouissime humani generis inimico erga tranquilos et vnanimos interdum sissaniam dissidii seminante vna cum potioribus Praelatis, Baronibus et Proceribus regni nostri ex subdolo astu et pseudolo instinctu ac praua suggestione et sinistro relatu ipsorum nostrorum infidelium et fautorum eorum, quorum inuidiae pestiferi surculi vipote locustae ex abyssi puteo ad nocendum erumpentes, nos regno nostro a praefato exterminare et nequiter eliminare satagebant ad incapacitatis noxam et discrimina deuenissemus antefatus reuerendus Pater Dominus Archiantistes, tanquam pacis alumnus, ex diuisis faciens vnum et ex caduco solidum, ipsos Praelatos et Barones nostrum quodammodo a nostra curia protunc auulsos in laribus ipsorum propriis compertos per sincerum dogma, vrbanitate sagaci et loquelae peritae modulis et verborum amoeno suorum contextu vt turbata corda reconciliauit, impacatos animos leniuit et commotae mentis austeritatem suis affatu et doctrina mulcere maluit et sopire non cessauit ipsosque ad cuncta nostra beneplacita effectui mancipanda et illibate exequenda perduxit.*

Stephen Lackfi, formulated in 1397 in order to portray him as “the actual author and leader of the de Horvathi movement, a participant in all the crimes committed at the time and the author of all the evils that afflicted the country and the king”.⁷⁶

Although this story was widely accepted by later authors, starting with the chronicler John Thuróczy, and was seldom seen for what it really was – a part of a defamation campaign,⁷⁷ the modern historian must be careful when judging the real success of such an undertaking among its contemporaries. The murder of Stephen Lackfi and the consequent defamation campaign meant to portray him as a “traitor” is illustrative in this sense. Although the King and his archbishop even resorted to threats and coercion to suppress alternative accounts about the end of Lackfi and his cousins,⁷⁸ it is unexpectedly Paul de Paulo who unveils the alternative version. Almost as a footnote to his information unit about the relations of his commune and the King in 1396/97, he simply states that on the February 26, 1387, in the royal quarters in Križevci *Stephanus Laccovich* was murdered by some Hungarian barons, while the information about what transpired there arrived in Zadar on March 6.⁷⁹ That means that rival stories about Lackfi’s murder circulated right from the start – it was on March 4, 1397, that the first charter with the details concerning his “treason” was redacted and issued. Still, the *narratio*, or Kanizsai’s version, was preserved and later on used again, which testifies that it was, at least partially, successful, and that could not be said about the story of Elizabeth’s death.

The story about the Queen’s murder never again appeared in the *narrationes*, not even in the aforementioned larger story about the “treason” of Stephen Lackfi, although that would be the proper place to tell it again, especially in the charter issued on January 6, 1401, in which the misdeeds of

⁷⁶ The story is fully rendered in at least three charters produced by royal chancellery in the span of four years: CDH, X/2, pp. 415-417, nr. CCXLVI, April 4, 1397; 557-563, nr. CCC, December 1, 1398; *Zala vármegye törtéte*, (ed.) Imre Nagy, Dezső Véghely, Gyula Nagy, Budapest, 1890, pp. 300-306, nr. 119, January 6, 1401. The quote comes from E. MÁLYUSZ, *op. cit.* (n. 1), p. 47.

⁷⁷ Writing close to the end of the 15th century, John Thuróczy combined different sources in constructing the “Lackfi story”. For what is pertinent here, when he gives reasons for his murder, he is simply retelling the story about Lackfi’s “treason” taken from the charters, as he otherwise used to do. For his text that lapidarily reiterates what is told in the charters cited in the previous note see the chapter entitled *De penis per regem Sigismundum a Stephano wayuoda et ceteris infidelibus exactis* (I am using the Augsburg edition of *Chronica Hungarorum* from 1488, accessible at <https://corvina.hu/kepnezegeto/index.php?corvina=inc1143&lang=en&img=228#228> - accessed January 3, 2020; the text is here on the page 228). Thuróczy’s use of the *narrationes* from charters is discussed in K. SZENDE, *The Uses of Archives in Medieval Hungary*, in: *The Development of Literate Mentalities in East Central Europe*, (ed.) Anna Adamska, Marco Mostert, Turnhout, 2004, pp. 138-139. It was Elemér Mályusz who recognized the story as a part of smear campaign (E. MÁLYUSZ, *op. cit.* /n. 1/ p. 47), but he did not further pursue the subject in order to ascertain what were the facts and what was the fiction in that story.

⁷⁸ Brothers Stephen, “called Fanch”, and Fanch, the *familiares* of Stephen Lackfi, were forced under the threat of death penalty to solemnly swear before the chapter of Pécs not to speak of what transpired when their *dominus* was murdered. They also provided more than thirty guarantors that they would keep their promise. MOL DL nr. 8333, June 9, 1398; *Zsigmondkori oklevéltár*, (ed.) Elemér Mályusz, I, Budapest, 1951, pp. 590-591, nr. 5355.

⁷⁹ *Eodem anno die martis 26 februarii in Crisi in curia domini nostri regis Sigismundi interfectus fuit Stephanus Laccovich cum nepote suo per certos barones Vngarie de quo venit novum Iadram die 6 martii sequentis*; see I. LUCIUS DALMATINUS, *op. cit.* (n. 32), p. 429 (almost needless to say – February 26, 1397, was indeed Thursday). The document cited in the previous note nicely dovetails with Paul’s diary entry providing the list of barons who were implicated: *contra et aduersus magnificos viros comitem Cilii, Detricum Bubek regni Hungarie palatinum ac filios et successores suos, item Nicolaum et Iohannem de Gara regnorum Sclauonie et Dalmacie banos ac filios et successores eorundem, item Nicolaum Treutul fratres et filios eiusdem, magistros Nicolaum et Stephanum de Kanisa, Iohannem de Maroth (et) Franciscum Bubek banos Machouienses, Nicolaum de Zeech, Symonem filium Konye bani, Ladislaum filium Pauli de Gara, Stephanum de Dobre, Nicolaum filium Petri de Machedonya et filios Bodizlay de Korbauia ac quoslibet alios qui in huiusmodi perpetracionem dictorum Stephani wayuode et alterius Stephani filii Dyonisy wayuode et suos adherentes ac facta premissis capituitatibus, exulacionibus, possessionum, rerum et bonorum ablacionibus, nocumentorum, dampnorum et iniuriarum irrogacionibus et aliis quibusuis circa premissa et occasione eorundem quomodolibet perpetratis verbo vel facto, consilio, auxilio vel fauore participes extiterunt.*

both ban John de Horvathi and prior John de Palissna are rendered.⁸⁰ It is omitted even from the grand *narratio* in the charter of donation for the brothers Nicholas and John de Gara issued on August 1, 1406, in the name of King Sigismund. It narrates the merits of the brothers, covering the time span of the last twenty years, including the episode of the de Horvathi and de Palissna “rebellion”. What is even more curious is that the text clearly points to the conclusion that its author simply forgot the time of Elizabeth’s death,⁸¹ let alone her murder.

What remains now is to try to answer the question why the story about the “murder of the Queen”, probably devised and developed by the Archbishop John de Kanizsai in order to smear the names of the members of the de Horvathi and de Palissna faction and to provide justification for the act that proclaimed them “traitors”, never gained popularity and was not successfully promoted to the status of the “official truth”. The answer to that question must start with a discussion of the channels through which that story was disseminated as a piece of political propaganda. Today, with the sort of sources a modern historian of Hungary-Croatia has at his disposal, the only channel that is visible is a royal charter and its *narratio*. We do not know whether there were other forms of written communication that could have been used,⁸² but as far as our knowledge goes, the life in Hungary-Croatia at the end of the 14th century was still predominantly focused on orality, with a very narrow scope of social communication committed to writing.⁸³ In a situation like this it is obviously hard to find traces of oral communication in the written sources. However, in this specific case there are such traces, and it is possible to see that at least in the circles of social elite the story about the murder of Queen Elizabeth was really kept alive, but also that it was changed according to specific circumstances. The first instance when it was recorded and fixed in a written text occurred not long after the presumed murder took place, but not in Hungary-Croatia. It was written down in Venice, as an appendix to the *Chronicle* of Raphael (Raffaino) Caresini, a Venetian chancellor and politician/diplomat who died in 1390. It forms part of an appendix to his text and isn’t included in all nineteen extant copies of the work, but is usually ascribed to Caresini on the grounds of “internal critique”.⁸⁴

⁸⁰ *Zala vármegye törtéte, op. cit.* (n. 69), p. 301.

⁸¹ The charter is edited in F. ŠIŠIĆ, *Nekoliko isprava iz početka XV st., Starine JAZU*, 37, Zagreb, 1939, pp. 276-287, nr. 108. Narrating the armed clashes between Nicholas de Gara, at that time the ban of Mačva, with ban John de Horvathi, the author of the text gives as time reference Sigismund’s crowning on March 31, 1387, and then continues narrating what happened in April and May of that year. He comes to the point of the story where ban John surrenders in the fort of Požega after a series of clashes, offering to free the Queens in exchange for his personal freedom (F. ŠIŠIĆ, *op. cit.* /n. 81/, p. 278): *Senciens itaque dictus Johannes banus se evadere non posse, quamvis suam personam in signum obsidis sub eo pacti articulo ut ipse prescriptas utrasque dominas reginas, pro quibus iamfatus Nicolaus pater prescripti alterius Nicolai nunc palatini laudabilem mortem subiit, pristinae libertati redderet manibus et potestati sepefati Nicolai assignasset.* The problem is that according to the official version produced in 1387, ban John had murdered Queen Elizabeth in January of that year and her death was already a well-known fact at the time of the siege of Požega! The mere fact that the story is rendered in a similar way two years later, in another royal charter of donation – see *CDH*, X/4, pp. 660-678, nr. CCCXIII, July 12, 1408 (here p. 664) – goes to show that at this point in time nobody in the royal chancellery cared about such chronological inconsistency or even straight-out fallacy.

⁸² For the specter of the possible genres of the written texts that were at this time used for the dissemination of political propaganda see discussion in J. VERGER, *Théorie politique et propagande politique*, in: *Le forme della propaganda, op. cit.* (n. 2), pp. 29-44.

⁸³ On the subject see E. FÜGEDI, *Verba Volant ... Oral culture and literacy among the medieval Hungarian nobility*, in: IDEM, *Kings, Bishops, Nobles and Burghers in Medieval Hungary*, (ed.) János M. Bak, No. 6, 1-25; L. VESZPREMÝ, *The Birth of a Structured Literacy in Hungary*, in: *The Development of Literate op. cit.* (n. 77), 161-181.

⁸⁴ On Caresini and his work see E. PASTORELLO, *Introduzione*, in: *Raphayni de Caresinis cancellarii Venetiarum Chronica aa. 1343-1388 (Raccolta degli storici Italiani XII-2)*, (ed.) Ester Pastorello, Bologna, pp. V-XXXII, as well as entry “CARESINI, Rafaino” in *Dizionario Biografico degli Italiani* by Antonio Carile - [http://www.treccani.it/enciclopedia/rafaino-caresini_\(Dizionario-Biografico\)/](http://www.treccani.it/enciclopedia/rafaino-caresini_(Dizionario-Biografico)/) (accessed Januray 3, 2020).

The part of the text that is of concern here briefly tells the story about Charles of Durazzo's arrival in Hungary and his subsequent death, and then goes on to tell the story about Queen Mary and vagaries that fell upon her.⁸⁵ On the one hand, the author shows poor knowledge of what was really going on in Hungary-Croatia in 1386/87, making it clear that he got his story second-hand: he states that the "Hungarians and Dalmatians" were not content with the rule of Queen Mary and her husband Sigismund;⁸⁶ the Queens were caught by the *brothers* John de Horvathi and John de Palissna (at least he ascribes proper titles to them) while traveling to Dalmatia;⁸⁷ the Queen was liberated by military intervention of Venetian forces and transported by their galleys to Senj;⁸⁸ she, her husband, and three Venetian ambassadors happily travelled from Zagreb to Buda.⁸⁹ On the other hand, the author of the text in the appendix of Caresini's *Chronicle* knew a lot of details concerning the mission of the Venetian ambassador Pantaleone Barbo. Apart from his name, he knew the exact date of Sigismund's coronation, the location where the Queens were held (Novigrad), as well as the names of the captain of the Venetian galleys in the service of Queen Mary and five nobles who paid service to her in Senj. His statement that Elizabeth was murdered in Novigrad while imprisoned there obviously comes from that context and mirrors (one of) the version(s) that circulated among Venetian ruling circles (although Caresini belonged to the same circle as Lawrence de Monacis – both were notaries and diplomats – it is quite clear that the author of the text rendered in the appendix of the *Chronicle* was not familiar with *Carmen de Carolo Parvo*, which provides a strong argument against Caresini's authorship of the text under discussion here). A further trace of oral transmission of the story among the elite circles of the Kingdom can be discerned in the work of John Thuróczy, whose *Chronica Hungarorum* was put in print in 1488. On this occasion it is enough to point out that the story about the killing of Queen Elizabeth after a whole century of oral transmission became almost unrecognizable – in Thuróczy's version the Queen Regent was killed, or to be precise, drowned in

⁸⁵ Text in *Raphayni de Caresinis op. cit.* (n. 84), pp. 66 l. 35-68 l. 27.

⁸⁶ *Raphayni de Caresinis op. cit.* (n. 84), p. 67 ll. 6-7: *Iamdixtus Carolus, ad suasionem Hungarorum et Dalmaticorum non contentium de regimine dictae Mariae supradictae et Sigismundi sponsi eius*. It is unclear who the "Dalmatians" could be, while Sigismund entered the political life of the Kingdom only after the Queens were taken into custody by de Horvathi and de Palissna.

⁸⁷ *Raphayni de Caresinis op. cit.* (n. 84), p. 67 ll. 14-17: *... dum ipsa regina Elisabeth, cum rege Maria filia sua ... descenderet ad partes Dalmatiae fuit per insidias, a Ioanne banno et priore Aurannae fratre suo ... capta*. As was said earlier, the Queens rode to Djakovo to solve problems there – at that moment Dalmatia was nowhere near their horizon. Today historians know a lot about John de Horvathi and John de Palissna, but it is quite clear that they were in no way related.

⁸⁸ *Raphayni de Caresinis op. cit.* (n. 84), p. 68 ll. 5-9: *Venetiarum potentia ... misit nobilem virum Iohannem Barbadico capitaneum, cum galeis optime armatis ... (he) potenter descendens in terram, adeo expugnavit et armavit ipsum priorem Aurannae, quod per vim coegit eum ad restituendum ipsam (sc. Mariam), quam super galeis transducit Signam*. As was said earlier, the Queen *exited* Novigrad citadel on the *morning* of June 4, 1387, and was stationed in the royal *villa* Dolac, an architectural complex that functioned as a center of the royal domain (for the royal *villa* at Dolac see M. ANČIĆ, Architecture on Royal Domains in Northern Dalmatia, *Hortus Artium Medievalium*, 13/1, p. 207). Residing in Dolac, on the same day the Queen sent a certain Thomas Savić from Šibenik as her envoy to the cities of Šibenik, Trogir, and Split, giving him credential letter (*CDC XVIII*, p. 69, nr. 51). Then she left for the city of Nin where she spent almost two weeks, to be transported to Senj on a Venetian galley only on June 15, 1387.

⁸⁹ *Raphayni de Caresinis op. cit.* (n. 84), p. 68 ll. 25-27: *subsequenter regia et reginalis excellentia, ispisque tres ambassatores, scilicet Leonardus Dandulo, Paulus Mauroceno et Pantaleone Barbo milites, Budam, cum eximia laetitia, pervenerunt*. After spending July together in Zagreb and its surroundings, Sigismund and Mary parted their ways to be reunited only somewhere around September 10, 1387, in Varad – see ENGEL – TÓTH, *op. cit.* (n. 21) pp. 39 and 58. Venetian ambassadors joined Sigismund and sojourned together in Čazma in the last days of August (see n. 10 here), not to be mentioned in existing documents after that. The King and the Queen reached Buda as late as the second half of the November 1387.

the river Bosut, on the night after the battle of Djakovo.⁹⁰ The mere fact that Thuróczy, who took the material from the *narrationes* of royal charters whenever it was possible (see n. 77 here), used here a deformed orally transmitted tradition, clearly corroborates my starting point – the story about Elizabeth’s killing rendered in the charter issued on September 14, 1387, was seldom, if ever, used again in royal charters. Its circulation was confined to oral transmission in later times, which led, naturally, to the deformation of the story.⁹¹

From all that has been said up till now it may be surmised that the main obstacle for the success of the story rendered in the charter issued on September 14, 1387, was the unwillingness of Queen Mary to fully back the story narrated in that charter. She was obviously not in a position to openly challenge the truthfulness of the story devised in Sigismund’s circle, but at the same time she was able to circulate a rumor about what transpired during the time that she and her mother spent in prison in Novigrad (she was evidently not in the same position as brothers Stephen and Fanch who were forced to “keep their mouths shut”). The reasons for this are not hard to disentangle – the young Queen must have been unhappy with the way her spouse and his clique deprived her of the position of the rightful ruler. She did voice her opinion on the subject through the text of Lawrence de Monacis (*Nolo refutare ingeminat diadema paternum et mihi jure datum* – see note 24 here), as well as in practical acts (right after the release from Novigrad she promoted a Zadar nobleman to the office of “royal admiral”; her messengers obtained the solemn oath of the Dubrovnik commune to her as the rightful ruler and to Sigismund only as her spouse). It would not be a surprise in this context if she had found common ground with the count palatine Lackfi and other noblemen who were far from happy with Sigismund’s rule. A sign of that common ground is the way the clash between the de Gara and de Horvathi clans was interpreted, as a “private war”, both by the count palatine and the Queen.

All of this goes to explain the conclusion, reached when Sigismund’s and Mary’s itineraries are analyzed, that they seldom spent time together. What is even more telling in this context is the negligence Sigismund showed for the memorial services of his wife after her death in May 1395,⁹² making it clear in this way that by then she was only a nuisance to him. With that in mind, it becomes clear that the story about Elizabeth’s death was not simply a question of what really happened in Novigrad in January 1387. In fact, public stories like this, those that speak about past, are often closely connected with political identity and used to mobilize and give coherence to political networks, especially in the context of contentious politics⁹³, and in that way they fully qualify as “political propaganda”.

⁹⁰ *Chronica Hungarorum op. cit.* (n. 77), p. 213: *Dum autem nox superueniens illius diei fugata luce vndique suas diffudisset tenebras regina Elizabeth tollitur et frenatis faucibus amnis Bozwiha altis demergitur in aquas.*

⁹¹ For the logic of oral transmission of such stories, leading to their transformation and deformation see D.C. RUBIN, *Memory in Oral Traditions: The Cognitive Psychology of Epic, Ballads, and Counting-out Rhymes*, New York – Oxford, 1995, but also A.B. LORD, *The Singer of Tales*, Cambridge (Mass.), 2000², as well as E. TONKIN, *Narrating our past: The social construction of oral history*, Cambridge, 1993.

⁹² E. MÁLYUSZ, *op. cit.* (n. 1), pp. 57-58.

⁹³ On this see C. TILLY, *Stories, Identities, and Political Change*, Lanham, 2002.

Ubojstvo kraljice Elizabete – obrazac kasnosrednjovjekovne političke propagande

Autor polazi u raščlambu od teksta diplomatske formule *narratio* iz privilegija izdanoga u ime ugarsko-hrvatske kraljice Marije 14. rujna 1387. godine, u kojem se u prvome licu pripovijeda o tomu kako je – za vrijeme dok su ona i njezina majka bile zatvorene u Novigradu – Elizabeta ubijena pred samom Marijom. Nakon što je pokazao kako privilegij nije jednostavna kraljevska darovnica već složeni dokument koji donosi (navodnu) presudu (*decretum*) o krivnji braće Horvata i priora Ivana Paližne zbog izdaje, autor upozorava da ovdje nije riječ o standardnoj formuli *narratio* već o tekstu koji daje argumente za navodno donesenu presudu protiv braće Horvat zbog počinjene izdaje. U daljnjoj raščlambi autor tome tekstu suprotstavlja djelo *Carmen de Carolo Parvo* mletačkoga kancelara i diplomata Lovre de Monacisa, dokazujući da je to djelo nastalo na temelju informacija koje je autoru, tijekom neformalnih razgovora nakon dovršetka njegove diplomatske misije 1389. godine, dala sama kraljica Marija. Na temelju tih informacija, de Monacis je napisao djelo u kojem se prikazuju zbivanja koja su dovela do napada na kraljice nedaleko Đakova i njihova zarobljavanja u srpnju 1386. godine. Način na koji su tu prikazana zbivanja, pa i sam sukob kod Đakova, stubokom se razlikuje od prikaza istih događaja koji će se oblikovati u kancelariji kralja Sigismunda, i korespondira sa stajalištima o tome sukobu koja je artikuliralo ugarsko plemstvo u kolovozu 1386. godine. U obje verzije, i onoj koju donosi de Monacis, kao i onoj artikuliranoj u posebnome ediktu što ga je izdalo plemstvo, sukob se interpretira kao „privatni rat” klanova Gorjanskih i Horvata, pri čemu postupci Horvata i njihovih pristaša nisu usmjereni protiv kraljevske vlasti, pa samim time ne mogu biti ni činovi izdaje, odnosno „uvrede veličanstva”.

U nastavku autor raščlanjuje tekst dnevničkih zapisa zadarskoga plemića, odvjetnika i političara Pavla de Paula, koji govore o zarobljeništvu kraljica, smrti kraljice Elizabete i oslobađanju kraljice Marije. Pri tomu razmatra strukturu Pavlovih dnevničkih zapisa i način na koji je on zapisivao informacije kojima je raspolagao, prikupljene između ostaloga i kroz izravan dodir s glavnim protagonistima političke frakcije braće Horvat i priora Ivana Paližne, ali i s kraljicom Marijom nakon njezina oslobađanja. Temeljem tih razmatranja autor zaključuje kako tim zapisima, u kojima se govori o „smrti”, a ne „ubojstvu”, valja pokloniti više povjerenja no tekstu *narratio* iz privilegija od 14. rujna 1387. godine. Takav zaključak autor potvrđuje raščlambom zapisnika dubrovačkih gradskih vijeća koji govore o prispeću vijesti o Elizabetinoj smrti u taj grad i reakciji gradskih upravnih tijela.

S takvim rezultatima autor se okreće raščlambi načina na koji je oblikovana pripovijest o kraljičinu ubojstvu, utvrđujući da se ta pripovijest prvi put pojavila u pisanome obliku, opet u sklopu diplomatske formule *narratio*, u jednome kraljevskom privilegiju izdanom petnaestak dana prije no što je kraljica Marija bila oslobođena. K tomu upozorava da u prvome sačuvanom privilegiju izdanome u Marijino ime nakon njezina oslobađanja, a koji također ima relativno opširnu formulu *narratio* s opisom zbivanja u Đakovu i onoga što se događalo poslije zarobljavanja kraljica, nema niti spomena nasilne smrti njezine majke.

U tome kontekstu autor zaključuje kako je pripovijest o „ubojstvu kraljice” oblikovana u krugu oko Sigismunda, po svemu sudeći na inicijativu (izabranoga) ostrogonskog nadbiskupa i kraljevskoga kancelara Ivana Kanižaja, koji je u vremenu nakon Sigismundove krunidbe 31. ožujka 1387. godine postao glavni oslonac njegove vlasti i ključni čovjek u promoviranju „muža kraljice”, što je bio Sigismundov stvarni položaj, u okrunjenoga vladara. Različite verzije pripovijesti o zbivanjima iz godina 1386. i 1387. autor dovodi u svezu s postojanjem političkih frakcija u vladajućemu sloju Ugarsko-Hrvatskog Kraljevstva, zaključujući kako te pripovijesti predstavljaju „političku propagandu” onoga doba te ih upravo tako i treba čitati.

Ključne riječi: *Ugarsko-Hrvatsko Kraljevstvo, političke frakcije, srednjovjekovna politička propaganda*