

IN DEFENSE OF THEIR SEE: THE BISHOPS OF ZAGREB (1272-1301)

Antun Nekić

A. Nekić
Sveučilište u Zadru
Odjel za povijest
Ruđera Boškovića 5, HR-23000 Zadar
E-mail: anekic@unizd.hr

10.1484/M.DEM-EB.5.121640

The last quarter of the thirteenth century saw the weakening and ultimately the dying out of the Arpad dynasty, while the figures usually defined as oligarchs were on the rise. The considerable power and influence the Arpads had over the Church was also threatened. The present study takes the case study of the bishopric of Zagreb in the period between 1272 and 1301 in order to see how the bishops of Zagreb operated in this unstable political context, what threats to church's rights and possessions they encountered and how they responded to them. The paper is organized chronologically and looks at the ways in which the four bishops of Zagreb interacted with the royal court, local oligarchs, prelates of the kingdom, the cathedral chapter, and the middling/lower nobility.

Key words: *bishops of Zagreb, Ladislaus IV, Andrew III, oligarchs, Babonići, Kőszegi, 13th Century Kingdom of Hungary-Croatia*

During the last quarter of the thirteenth century the Kingdom of Hungary-Croatia was undergoing a period of instability. The period saw the weakening and ultimately the dying out of the Arpad dynasty, while the figures usually defined as oligarchs were on the rise. While the kings traditionally had a considerable power and influence over the Church, this period led not only to the open confrontations between the king and the prelates, as in Ladislaus IV's reign, but to the ever more aggressive attempts of the oligarchs to put the church institutions in the territories they dominated under their control. Modes of this control varied greatly, as did the responses of the people that headed these institutions.¹ The Church of Zagreb was always a strong pillar of royal authority, ever since it was established at the end of the 11th century as a royal endowment.² The aim of this paper is thus to look at how the bishops of Zagreb operated in this unstable political context, when the royalist stance was not always a possibility, and when the local pressures proved highly challenging for any bishop trying to defend his see and its material resources. The period in focus are the reigns of the last two Arpadian kings, Ladislaus IV (1272-1290) and Andrew III (1290-1301), during which time four bishops headed the Church of Zagreb. Their offices will serve as a basis of investigation conducted in a chronological fashion, especially since the topic of this paper has not received much attention.³

¹ See A. ZSOLDOS, *Kings and Oligarchs in Hungary at the Turn of the Thirteenth and Fourteenth Centuries*, *Hungarian Historical Review*, II/2, Budapest, 2013, pp. 227-228, and for further examples see A. NEKIĆ, *Društvene mreže i uspon oligarha: primjer Babonića (od 1270-ih do 1320-ih)*, *Historijski zbornik*, 70/1, Zagreb, 2017, pp. 26-31.

² For this see M. ANČIĆ, *Dva teksta iz sredine 14 stoljeća. Prilog poznavanju „društvenog znanja u Hrvatskom Kraljevstvu”*, *Starohrvatska prosvjeta* 40, Split, 2013, pp. 158-164.

³ Practically the only work is that of Lelja Dobronić written as a part of an edited volume on bishops of Zagreb, *Zagrebački biskupi i nadbiskupi*, (ed.) F. MIROŠEVIĆ, Zagreb, 1995, which is at moments no more than a simple retelling of a source material, without any further analyses.

TIMOTHY (1263-1287)

As Stephen died very soon after taking the throne, he was succeeded by his underage son, ten-year-old Ladislaus IV (1272-1290), who bore the royal title but whose rule was only nominal. It was his mother Elizabeth who tried to take the actual power in her hands, but by 1274 she was pushed out by the aristocratic factions that were struggling to control the court. These factions coalesced around the Gutkeled and Kőszegi families on one and Csák family on the other side. They were forming two parties that will dominate the court until 1277, one overthrowing the other in a constant struggle to dominate the royal court, a constellation in which it was especially important to obtain the post of a palatine.⁴ It was this instability that the bishop of Zagreb Timothy also had to cope with.⁵ The first information on his maneuverings in these turbulent struggles suggest he managed it well. Sometime between 17 July and 31 October 1273⁶ Medvedgrad, which was prior to that controlled by the Slavonian bans, was returned to Zagreb's bishopric. This was of utmost importance since the castle was, together with Kalnik, one of the keys for the control of the most part of Slavonia, as it would be expressed in a royal charter some 20 years later.⁷ The relevant royal charter can be dated even more precisely. Namely, Timothy was present at the royal court at the beginning of October, when he presented Stephen V's charter guaranteeing the privileges of the bishopric of Zagreb, which was then confirmed by Ladislaus.⁸ It could be presumed then that during the bishop's presence at the court the case of Medvedgrad was also discussed and the decision was made to return it into the bishop's hands. But whose decision was it? Unfortunately, it is impossible to say anything conclusively. The question, however, can be posed in another way. Who was at lost with such a decision? There is one answer to such question: Slavonian ban(s), who previously controlled the castle. At that specific moment the ban was Henrik Kőszegi, and thus it can only be concluded that the decision was made contrary to his interests.⁹ To this one has to add the case of another castle, Garić, which was apparently in Timothy's control since Ladislaus' coronation, when the king transferred it to Timothy's protection, as the royal charter from 1277 puts it.¹⁰ It is not possible to pin down this transfer more precisely, but it certainly happened in the first years of Ladislaus' reign, from which we can only conclude that Slavonian bans lost two castles which were returned/transferred to Timothy and his church. Timothy's power and strength were thus greatly boosted by these acts.

⁴ P. ENGEL, *The Realm of St. Stephen: A History of Medieval Hungary, 895-1526*, London, 2001, pp.107-108; J. SZŰCS, *Az utolsó Árpádok*, Budapest, 2002, pp. 391-402; A. ZSOLDOS, *The Árpáds and Their Wives. Queenship in Early Medieval Hungary 1000-1301*, Rome, 2019, pp. 143-152.

⁵ For Timothy's election see M. JERKOVIĆ, *Imenovanje papinoga kapelana Timoteja zagrebačkim biskupom 1263. godine: studija o odnosima srednjovjekovnih središta moći*, *Croatia Christiana periodica*, 39, Zagreb, 2015, pp. 27-48.

⁶ T. SMIČIKLAS et al., *Codex diplomaticus regni Croatiae, Dalmatiae et Slavoniae*, Zagreb, VI, doc. 48, pp. 52-53, (further CD) the document is dated only by the year, but the persons enumerated in the list of dignitaries – queen's chancellor Philip's start of office as *terminus post quem*, and the end of palatine Roland's office *terminus ante quem*, A. ZSOLDOS, *Magyarország Világi Archontológiája 1000-1300*, Budapest, 2011, pp. 20, 116 – suggests those two dates. N. KLAJČ, *Medvedgrad i njegovi gospodari*, Zagreb, 1987, pp. 34-36, considers the charter to be a forgery but without providing any valid argument; the author did not even bother to check the list of the dignitaries in the document – which is not suspicious in any way - thus not respecting what is certainly a first step when checking the authenticity of a document.

⁷ CD VII, doc. 30, pp. 36.

⁸ CD VI, doc. 43, pp. 46-47.

⁹ He held the position of ban between May 1273 and September 1274, A. ZSOLDOS, *op. cit.* (n. 6), p. 46.

¹⁰ CD VI, doc. 175, pp. 193.

Ban Henrik Kőszegi's discontent with such decisions can perhaps be ascertained in the royal charter from May 1274. It is the king's mandate to ban's and *magister tavernicorum*'s men charged with collection of taxes to stop levying them on the Church of Zagreb since it was exempted from such burdens.¹¹ Although the burden of *collecta* is more emphasized, and with it the misdeeds of the incumbent *magister tavernicorum* Joachim Gutkeled, considering the partnership of the Kőszegis and the Gutkeleds it can be safely concluded that the church resources were under threat from both of them. This continued in the following period. In August 1275 someone representing the Church of Zagreb was at the royal court, and, among other things, complaint regarding *collecta septem denariorum banalium* was made, which meant that Joachim was causing problems again.¹² But royal mandates proved futile, even though Joachim himself acknowledged church's rights in this regard in his own charter. Timothy was at the royal court in October 1275, dealing with the same matter again. He presented two Bela IV's charters, concerning estate Saint Martin near Vaška, which were confirmed, and the need apparently again stemmed from Joachim's unlawful claims.¹³ This picture can be contrasted with the mode of solving *collecta* problem when Matthew Csák was *magister tavernicorum*. Instead of procuring, as we saw, inefficient royal mandates, the bishop intervened directly with Matthew, and the job was assigned to magister Hab, whom Matthew refers to as his *cognatus karissimus*.¹⁴ The contrast thus indicates that Timothy was closer to the Csák party, which does not have to mean he openly supported them, but only that he managed to establish *modus vivendi* with them. The reason for this should be sought in the fact that Slavonia, and thus the bishopric of Zagreb, was not a territory where the Csáks tried to build their territorial power, which was precisely what the Kőszegis and the Gutkeleds were trying to do there.¹⁵ This local pressure was thus the reason why the former and Timothy had hard time living next to each other.

Besides building their territorial power, the Kőszegis and the Gutkeleds were in a constant struggle to control the court, and between January 1276 and middle of 1276 they had the upper hand in court politics.¹⁶ If we are to suppose a certain level of hostility between Timothy and them, how can one then explain several important donations to Timothy in the February and March 1277? Ladislaus confirmed Stephen V, Bela IV, and Andrew II's charters regarding immunities and liberties of the Church on 3 March – another sign these were infringed upon? – and on 27 February donated the estate Blaguša, some 20 km north-east of Zagreb, where in the next ten years Timothy would build a wooden fortress.¹⁷ On March 22 the king issued two more charters for Timothy – for whom it is indicated that he was in the king's presence then – one of them concerning the donation of the previously mentioned castle Garić.¹⁸

Returning to the question posed above, I would argue that we can be sure that these royal charters were a reflection of the king's own decisions and his own relations with the bishop Timothy,

¹¹ The mandate was directed to "collectoribus marturinarum, undecim et septem denariorum per Sclauoniam", CD VI, doc. 65, pp. 71. For tax system in Slavonia in this period see B. WEISZ, Kraljevsko oporezivanje u Slavoniji od doba Arpadovića do prve polovice doba Anžuvina, in: *Prekretnice u suživotu Hrvata Mađara: ustanove, društvo, gospodarstvo i kultura*, (eds.) P. Fodor, D. Šokčević, Budapest, 2015, pp. 285-293.

¹² CD, VI. doc. 108, 123-24.

¹³ CD VI, doc. 117, p. 130, doc. 126, p. 143., I. SZENTPÉTERY, *Az Árpádházi királyok okleveleinek kritikai jegyzéke* II/2-3, 1272–1290, Budapest, 1961, doc. 2655.

¹⁴ CD VI, doc. 144, pp. 158-159.

¹⁵ J. SZÚCS, *op. cit.* (n. 4), p. 402.

¹⁶ *Ibidem*, p. 400.

¹⁷ CD VI, doc. 169, pp. 183-84, doc. 168, pp. 182-183. In both of these charters it is stated that the decision was made with the approval of the barons "qui tunc temporis presentes nobiscum aderant". For the fort see L. DOBRONIĆ, *op. cit.* (n. 3), p. 70.

¹⁸ CD VI, doc. 175, p. 193.

and were not a part of aristocratic power plays conducted in the name of the king. For an explanation it is necessary to broaden the picture and look at the political developments of the first half of 1277. Firstly, it is instructive to take a look at the king's itinerary. After visiting the northwest of the kingdom, the king travelled to southern parts, issuing a charter in his mother Elizabeth's estate Lábod, Somogy county, in January, and his southern end point was, as it can be deduced, Timothy's estate Vaška in the middle of February.¹⁹ After that he was on his way north again, and we find him in another of his mother's estates, Aranyos in Somogy county, on 22 March, when Timothy was in his presence. It was on this date that the news from Transylvania on brutal Saxon attacks on the Church of Alba Iulia surely reached the king.²⁰ For the next information on his itinerary, from 26 April, I would propose that the toponym *Keurus* should be sought in Kőrös-patak in Vas county.²¹ The second half of April was a time when Ladislaus and Rudolf I made some sort of an agreement, as can be seen from Rudolf's letter.²² Ladislaus' movement towards the Hungarian-Austrian border is thus quite understandable, for it would have eased their communication. The meager information we have on Ladislaus' itinerary is thus still instructive, and shows his preoccupations before the turning point in May. He obviously relied on his mother, an important puzzle in his network of trustworthy men was Timothy, and the king and Rudolf deepened their mutual support.

Focusing on Timothy's relation with the king before May, but also on the subsequent events, it is more than obvious that Timothy was in that group of churchmen which instigated the promulgation of the 15-year-old Ladislaus' to be of age at the assembly held on Rákos at the end of May. It was a response against the growing violence which the kingdom found itself, and the most savage episodes concerned precisely the Church. This brought about the coalition of the young king and the group of churchmen, highly educated and influenced by specific ideas of government.²³ That Timothy had an important place in the plans for the reestablishment of royal power can also be seen in Timothy's participation in Ladislaus IV's further dealings with Rudolf, who was the king's most precious ally at the time, for Timothy was among the envoys to Rudolf in July 1277.²⁴ Furthermore, not only did the king intervene to protect the bishopric's resources,²⁵ but he greatly expanded them. The king donated Garešnica, which was not an estate but a county (*comitatus*), and which was to be held by a perpetual right by the bishops of Zagreb; the donation also secured complete exclusion of any kind of interference (whether judicial or monetary) by the ban or any royal official in the new bishop's acquisition.²⁶ By donating Garešnica, Ladislaus followed in the footsteps of his father

¹⁹ T. Kádár, *IV. László király itineráriuma, 1264-(1272)-1290*, *Fons*, 23, Budapest, 2016, pp. 19-20. Thus far I agree with the author's reconstruction, but for the next two places of the king's stay I would argue differently. As for *Oronyos*, I follow the author's clue regarding the king's stay at his mother's estate, thus I identify *Oronyos* with Aranyos attached to Segesd, owned by queen mother, see A. ZSOLDOS, *op. cit.* (n. 4), 47, 49, for Lábod see 48-49.

²⁰ See T. Sălăgean, *Transylvania in the Second Half of the Thirteenth Century: The Rise of the Congregational System*, Leiden, 2016, pp. 121-22.

²¹ For general identification of toponym *Keurus* as Kőrös-patak in Vas county see T. ALMÁSI, *Anjou-kori Oklevéltár*, XII, 1328, (Budapest-Szeged, 2001, p. 335; T. SZÓCS, *Damus pro memoria-oklevelek - A Magyar Országos Levéltár kiadványai*, Budapest, 2017, p. 377.

²² O. REDLICH, *Eine Wiener Briefsammlung zur Geschichte des deutschen Reiches und der österreichischen Länder in der zweiten Hälfte des XIII Jahrhunderts*, Wien, 1894. For their relations in this period see G. VARGA, *Ungarn und das Reich vom 10. bis zum 13. Jahrhundert. Das Herrscherhaus der Árpáden zwischen Anlehnung und Emanzipation*, München, 2003, pp. 285-86.

²³ For Rákos and the role of churchmen, among whom he also counts Timothy, see J. SZÚCS, *op. cit.* (n. 4), pp. 406-9.

²⁴ CD VI, doc. 186, pp. 211-214.

²⁵ Again concerning St. Martin near Vaška, CD VI, doc. 196, pp. 227-228; since the authentic transcription of the charter was made by the Esztergom chapter on 4 July it is obvious that the royal charter was issued in June.

²⁶ L. DOBRONIC, *op. cit.* (n. 3), p. 70.

who gave the Esztergom County to the archbishop of Esztergom in 1270.²⁷ Garešnica was probably a wealthy *comitatus*, but moreover its geographical position merits attention: it was situated in the vicinity of Garić, from which one could control Garešnica to a large degree. These two were also in the vicinity of other lands of Church of Zagreb (Čazma being the closest), and they formed together a huge complex of lands belonging to the Church of Zagreb, stretching from Zagreb to the county of Garešnica, and making the bishop and the chapter without a question one of the biggest landowners in Slavonia (the estates that the incumbent ban controlled were larger, but soon after this date they would be rapidly seized by the oligarchs).²⁸ Unfortunately, the charter registering the royal donation has been dated only by the year; its *terminus ante quem* is 28 July 1277,²⁹ but there are good indications for the conclusion that the donation was made somewhere in June.³⁰ This decision can be seen as a reaction to the local Slavonian circumstances. During the spring (due to the lack of sources it is impossible to establish a firm chronology, but probably in April) the hostilities between the *societas* of the Babonići kindred on one side and Joachim Gutkeled and Kőszegi family on the other reached its zenith, culminating in the death of Joachim Gutkeled, until then the strongest figure among both opposing parties. His death was a serious blow to his family's ambitions and it strongly influenced the reshaping of power relations in Slavonia.³¹ The donation of Garešnica can thus be seen as a move towards strengthening Timothy's position, for he seems to have become the king's most trusted man in Slavonia.

We are poorly informed about Timothy's activities during the next year, but the first precise information reveals him in the middle of the most pressing affair in Slavonia, namely putting the hostilities and havoc these brought to Slavonia to an end. A charter from November 1278 that registered an important peace treaty between the Babonići and the Gutkeleds opens with a list of a group of mediators, delegated by the king, which presided peace negotiations, with Timothy listed first, even

²⁷ N. TOTH, Hereditary Countship, *Transylvanian Review*, vol XIX, supplement 2, Cluj Napoca, 2010, p. 1082; M. RADY, *Nobility, Land and Service in Medieval Hungary*, New York, 2001, pp. 31-32.

²⁸ All of Timothy's land acquisition in the period after 1272 were prudently conducted, since the new acquisitions were in the vicinity of or precisely on the border of existing church estates. This was the case with royal donations – Faiz (CD, VI, pp. 108) in 1275, Blaguša, Garić – and also in the case of purchases for which see footnote 35 here. Generally, for the estates of the Church of Zagreb and their management (bishop's and those belonging to the chapters) see L. DOBRONIĆ, Topografija zemljišnih posjeda zagrebačkih biskupa prema ispravi kralja Emerika iz god. 1201., RAD JAZU, II, Zagreb, 1951, pp. 245-318; idem, Topografija zemljišnih posjeda zagrebačkog kaptola prema izvorima XIII i XIV stoljeća, RAD JAZU, II, Zagreb, 1951, pp. 171-256. Gajer, Radovan. „Posjedi zagrebačkog kaptola oko Zagreba u prvoj polovici 14. st.“. *Radovi: Sveučilište u Zagrebu – Institut za hrvatsku povijest* 11, Zagreb, 1978, pp. 5-102. N. KLAIĆ, *Zagreb u srednjem vijeku*, Zagreb, 1982, pp. 304-327, 398-442; M. CEPETIĆ, Granice srednjovjekovnih biskupskih posjeda Dubrave, Ivanića i Čazme, *Starohrvatska prosvjeta*, III/40, Split, 2013, pp. 217-233; idem, Srednjovjekovni Ivanić - razvoj i prostorna organizacija naselja, *Zbornik Odsjeka za povijesne znanosti Zavoda za povijesne i društvene znanosti Hrvatske akademije znanosti i umjetnosti*, 33, Zagreb, 2015, pp. 21-48.

²⁹ The charter was written by Demeter, royal vice-chancellor, who held the post until that date; A. ZSOLDOS, *op. cit.* (n. 6), p. 112.

³⁰ The royal charter is very specific when it emphasizes that the king is taking into account what Timothy has done „in regni nostri negociis et coram nostre maiestatis oculis“, which seems to point precisely to Timothy's activities in May/June, and can be contrasted with the royal charters from February and March which just vaguely speak of him as *fidelis*. Furthermore, when the king on 22 March confirmed Timothy's donation of a certain piece of land the former bought and then donated to his chapter, Timothy asked for this land to be exempted from jurisdiction of the ban and the count of Garešnica, which would have been unnecessary if Timothy had already obtained the *comitatus*, CD, VI, doc. 174, pp. 192-93.

³¹ For these political struggles see N. KLAIĆ, *Povijest Hrvata u razvijenom srednjem vijeku*, Zagreb, 1976; H. KEKEZ, *Pod znamenjem propetog lava: Povijest knezova Babonića do kraja 14. stoljeća*, Zagreb, 2016, pp. 84-89.

before Palatine Matthew Csák, and backed by a number of mostly diocesan clergy.³² The role of the clergy, headed by Timothy, is understandable in an attempt to provide neutral men for the peace negotiations, and besides acting as mediators, these clergymen also provided one of the mechanisms by which the parties tried to uphold the agreement: spiritual sanction in form of excommunication, which was to be proclaimed on those breaching the agreement.³³ The bishop and the chapter also assumed another role stemming from this agreement. The opposing parties agreed that the Babonići and some of their allies would not conduct their lawsuits in front of a ban (who was then a member of the Gutkeleds) or some of his officials anymore, but in front of Timothy or the chapter, which practically meant the dissolution of the ban's judicial prerogatives.³⁴ It is not likely that Timothy consciously accepted this role in order to weaken the ban's authority, its outcome being part of unintended consequences; the primary motive should be sought on a level of short term goals directed towards securing the peace.

By expanding material resources and obtaining a new level of moral authority Timothy assumed another role in the local politics. He built up his own strength by providing protection to the lesser nobility whose material position worsened during these struggles. On three occasions during 1278 and 1279 several members of the Ača kindred sold their estates to the bishop, but these transactions were sales only in form. Behind them we can observe establishment of relationships that were grounded in protection which the bishop provided for those unable to cope with the instability of the political situation.³⁵

Attempts made after Rákos, for a time highly effective in fact, to restore the order in the kingdom and establish the young king's authority confronted an unexpected obstacle in the Cuman question, forced upon by the pope's legate Philip in 1279, and under this burden these efforts in the end collapsed. The Cuman question would transform some of the architects of Rákos, in the first place Lodomer, but also Timothy, in Ladislaus' bitter enemies.³⁶ Timothy was of course present at the synod at Buda in July 1279 with his fellow prelates,³⁷ and must have been present at the general assembly at Tétény at the end of the month. However, these efforts proved futile, and bitter struggles would ensue soon afterwards, and the kingdom would be once more permeated with violence, and even the king himself would be captured.³⁸ The Church of Zagreb headed by Timothy would also have its shares of troubles. Initial problems started when the inhabitants of Virovitica and Lipovac, which were the queen's possessions, refused to pay tithe and were subsequently put under interdict in November 1280.³⁹ In the meantime he made preparations to protect the properties of his bishopric by requesting a confirmation of royal donation of Garešnica and Garić from Lodomer and the legate Phillip in October 1280, and his fears proved more than valid. As he was returning from the legate's *curia* in the middle of March 1281 – which means he spent the period between October and March in the legate's company - he found out that his estate Vaška was devastated, and the same scene he

³² The full list includes the abbot of the Cistercian monastery of Topusko, Templar Girard, Hugo, hospitaler preceptor of Pakrac, and four members of the cathedral chapter of Zagreb: Provost Michael, Giraldu, the archdeacon of Sana, Dubica and Vrba, Mamfred, the archdeacon of Guercha, and Gregory, the canon of Zagreb. CD VI, doc. 224, pp. 261.

³³ CD VI, doc. 224, pp. 264.

³⁴ A. NEKIĆ, *op. cit.* (n. 1), p. 5.

³⁵ *Ibidem*, pp. 28-29.

³⁶ J. SZŰCS, *op. cit.* (n. 4), pp. 417-429; N. BEREND, *At the Gate of Christendom: Jews, Muslims and 'Pagans' in Medieval Hungary, c.1000 - c.1300*, Cambridge, 2001, pp. 171-189., P. ENGEL, *op. cit.* (n. 4), p. 109.

³⁷ CD VI, doc. 252, pp. 302-304; doc. 254, pp. 306-307.

³⁸ J. SZŰCS, *op. cit.* (n. 4), pp. 427-29, A. ZSOLDOS, *Téténytől a Hód-tóig. Az 1279 és 1282 közötti évek politikatörténetének vázlatja, Történelmi Szemle*, 39, Budapest, 1997, pp. 80-86.

³⁹ L. DOBRONIĆ, *op. cit.* (n. 3), pp. 71-72.

found at some other unnamed estates. The culprits, Nicolaus, the Slavonian ban at the time, John and Henrik Kőszegi, did more than that. They took Garešnica and Garić from the bishop, refused to pay tithe to the bishop, imprisoned and tortured some of his men, and Timothy responded by excommunicating them on 25 March in the Franciscan church in Virovitica and putting their lands under interdict.⁴⁰ Bishop Timothy's decision to proclaim excommunication from Virovitica, an important queen's *comitatus*, was probably intended to send a strong political message and to point out to the joint actions against him by the queen mother and the Kőszegis acting in concert. It must have been Timothy's support for the legate Philip that led to strained relations with the queen mother Elizabeth who stood firmly by her son. It would thus not be surprising if the Kőszegis were retaliating for the harsh measures against the queen's subjects, although they had their interest also, as they took Garić and Garešnica from the bishop. In the April charter, where these attacks were described, the bishop emphasized that the Kőszegis ignored the legate's and the king's urges to return what they took. While Philip's exhortations must have been sincere, those of the king seemed as a pure formality, since he placed John Kőszegi as a palatine in June 1281⁴¹: high politics and expediency ruled the day.

Queen mother Elizabeth was given a prominent role from December 1279 as a duchess of Mačva and Bosnia, and from the first quarter of 1282 – first mention in March – the scope of her authority was extended to *totius Sclavonie* (until 1283).⁴² Since at the same time there was a change at the office of palatine, this can be seen as an attempt at reorganization of the court's political configurations, in which the Kőszegis found themselves on the losing side.⁴³ Widening of her authorities also meant reorganization at the local, Slavonian, level, and her new ban was Denis Pécs, while John, son of Junk, became the count of Garešnica.⁴⁴ For Timothy this change only meant that someone else was usurping his rights. Furthermore, in the same period he also lost Vaška, as we see from Ladislaus' letter from August 1282 addressed to his mother, with whom the king intervened numeral times to return it to Timothy, but all of this to no avail.⁴⁵

Royal policy for the southern part of the kingdom changed again in the middle of 1283. While Elizabeth was still titled *maior regina Hungarie, ducissa totius Sclavonie, de Machou et de Bozna* in January 1283, in September she is titled only as *regina Hungarie* in the royal charter,⁴⁶ and in her own charter from November 1284 she is titled *dei gracia maior regina Hungarie*.⁴⁷ I suppose that the death of the palatine Mathew Csák sometime in the spring of 1283 led to the partial reconfiguration of the royal court. His place was taken by Denis of Pécs kindred, who was previously the ban of Slavonia, and in his stead the king gave the post to Peter Pekri of the Teteny kindred, who appears as such in June⁴⁸, right about the time when the king was "*in communi congregatione baronum et nobilium regni nostri*" on 20 June at Buda.⁴⁹ It seems thus that it was on this occasion that the decision was made to relieve Elizabeth of her wide authorities, and as far as the extremely meagre

⁴⁰ CD VI, doc. 324, pp. 382-384.

⁴¹ A. ZSOLDOS, *op. cit.* (n. 38), 90.

⁴² A. ZSOLDOS, *op. cit.* (n. 4), pp. 167-69.

⁴³ Matthew Csák became palatine in March 1282, A. ZSOLDOS, *op. cit.* (n. 6), p. 22; J. SZŰCS, *op. cit.* (n. 4), p. 430.

⁴⁴ CD Supplementa, 2, doc. 54, p. 120.

⁴⁵ CD VI, doc. 105, p. 120, but for correct dating see, I. SZENTPÉTERY, *op. cit.* (n. 13), doc. 3155.

⁴⁶ CD VI, doc. 374, pp. 442. Ladislaus by this act confirmed his mother's charter from 1282, and thus it seems that the recipients felt a need to have it confirmed when Elizabeth was not there to guarantee it.

⁴⁷ CD, VI, doc. 378, pp. 447. She is once more titled the duchess of Bosna and Mačva in the first half of 1284, but at that moment it was an empty title, as Mačva would soon be taken over by Stefan Dragutin, A. ZSOLDOS; *Ducissa Sclavoniae* in: *Studia professoris — professor studiorum. Tanulmányok Érszegi Géza havvanadik születésnapjára*, (eds.) T. Almási, I. Draskóczy, E. Jancsó, Budapest, 2005, p. 388.

⁴⁸ I. SZENTPÉTERY, *op. cit.* (n. 13), doc. 3241, gives the right date, 24 June.

⁴⁹ *Ibidem*, doc. 3225.

material reveals, it was exactly Peter Pekri who took a part of her powers.⁵⁰ Not only was the ban of Slavonia, but he got Garić, and he was the count of Garešnica and Baranja, as is attested in October.⁵¹ This meant that Timothy was far from able to recover Garić and Garešnica, while the king surely granted these with the full knowledge that he was infringing on church's rights. Still, once more the political plans, part of which Timothy was not even closely, dictated the king's decision and disregard for Timothy's pleas.

This political realignment on the other hand also meant that queen mother was not so involved in the political affairs and there was a possibility to reconcile with Timothy. Judging by the queen's promise from 18 November 1283 to return the tithe from the county of Virovitica to Bishop Timothy, the two parties reconciled as similar issues were no longer mentioned.⁵² In June 1284 that deal was confirmed by Ladislaus IV and his wife, the queen Elizabeth.⁵³ Not only did the king confirm this deal, but he also confirmed his donation of the Garešnica county, for which he acknowledged it was previously, on improper requests, donated to certain nobles.⁵⁴ What led to this turnaround, that Ladislaus – at least formally, since we do not know if Timothy really got these back immediately – reinstated Timothy's rights? One could easily look for it in the general mood of the king, in the spirit of hopelessness after he failed to subdue the Kőszegis in the first months of the year.⁵⁵ After he abandoned every hope of establishing his authority, meeting the pleas of the bishop who attended him surely did not present a high cost for the king.

The sources about Timothy's activities after he returned from the court are sparse. The bishop consecrated an altar dedicated to Virgin Mary in the cathedral church in August 1284 and he was buried there after his death on 4 April 1287.⁵⁶ Throughout his life, regardless of the occasional strife with the king, and even when Ladislaus was far from holding the reins of government, Timothy operated in a mindscape where the king was considered to be the ultimate foundation of political order, not only on theoretical but also on the practical level. Finally, in Timothy's time, from the perspective of the Church, the Kőszegis appear as villains, and the Babonići, who were spreading their influence from the region between the rivers Sava, Glina and Una, are nowhere to be seen, but this would change pretty soon, as these noble families were turning into oligarchs whose appetites were getting bigger.

JOHN (1287-95)

Besides one charter that he issued, the only piece of information on Anthony (1287), the next, short-lived bishop of Zagreb, comes from the short text under the heading "*De nominibus et temporibus regiminum episcoporum zagrabiensis ecclesie*" (hereafter "The list", as this short text is known in Croatian historiography), written by an unknown author in the middle of the 14th century, and attached to the *Statuta capituli Zagrabiensis*, whose first version was written by the archdeacon Ivan Gorički in 1330s.⁵⁷ The short remark about Anthony, besides recording the time of his incumbency – only six months – and the time of his death (November 1287), reveals that he was elected to the post from

⁵⁰ For a different view see A. ZSOLDOS, *op. cit.* (n. 4), p. 173, and the literature quoted there.

⁵¹ CD VI, doc. 377, p. 446.

⁵² CD VI, doc. 378, pp. 447-8.

⁵³ CD VI, doc. 400-402, pp. 482-485.

⁵⁴ CD VI, doc. 404, 487-8.

⁵⁵ J. SZŰCS, *op. cit.* (n. 4), p. 436.

⁵⁶ L. DOBRONIĆ, *op. cit.* (n. 3), p. 76.

⁵⁷ Ivan Krstitelj Tkalčić, *Monumenta Historica Episcopatus Zagrabiensis. Povjestni spomenici zagrebačke biskupije*, vol. II, Zagreb, 1874 (further MHEZ).

prepositura Albensi, that is from the church of Székesfehérvár.⁵⁸ This could indicate that he came to the post at the intervention from someone at the royal court or through an intervention from the Hungarian prelates.⁵⁹ Whatever might be the case, his office, as could be expected, left no lasting mark.

Anthony's successor in the bishop's office was John, the provost of the Zagreb cathedral chapter, who held the office until 31 October 1295. Due to the several writings from the early modern period John's time has been depicted through two themes: that he was an Angevin supporter and that he was in conflict with his chapter, which supported Andrew III as a king.⁶⁰ These claims cannot be backed by sources. Andrew III supported the cathedral chapter with his donations, and even though there are no sources speaking about the bishop's involvement with the king, there are not any sources revealing any kind of contact between John and the Angevins either. Furthermore, there are no signs that John had any kind of disagreement with the chapter.⁶¹ The idea of the conflict between them is one of the leitmotifs of the work of Baltazar Adam Krčelić. Quoting Ivan Gorički as his source for John's time, Krčelić writes that John alienated church goods and that he persecuted the Church, mostly the chapter.⁶² The meaning that the writer of the short remark in "The List" made of John says something entirely different: that in his time the church lost Medvedgrad and through it the Church, and especially the cathedral chapter, suffered greatly.⁶³ John's support for the Angevins and his conflict with the cathedral chapter have thus no grounds in the contemporary source material, and it remains an open question which written sources or oral traditions writers from the early modern period used in writing about the medieval Church of Zagreb.

The details of John's election are unknown, but it is clear that as the provost of the Zagreb chapter he was a local candidate. There are at least two possibilities. Judging by John's reliance on the Babonić and their men during part of his tenure, the first one is that he was sponsored by them as these oligarchs, following the way they extended their control over the Cistercian monastery of Topusko, tried to influence the most important ecclesiastical institution in Slavonia.⁶⁴ The other possibility is that John's election was conducted independently by the chapter, whose members could have found themselves with the opportunity to freely elect one of their own, as John's election came very soon after the brief term in office of his predecessor. In that case John's open collaboration with the Babonići might have resulted from his realization how weak his position was and the need to rely on the local elites to protect his Church effectively.

This second option seems to me as a more plausible solution. John's connections with the Babonići can be best seen through his contacts with Grdun, a distinguished Slavonian nobleman whose family's rise during this period was closely connected to that of the Babonići.⁶⁵ The first news about these connections comes from 1289 from a bishop's charter. John complained about the infidelity of Ugrin, the castellan of Garić, and the troubles the province of Čazma suffered from him, which was the reason for the bishop to take certain land in *comitatus* Ivanić from him and confer it to Grdun, for the amount of money (30 marks) Grdun previously lent to him.⁶⁶ On the next occasion Grdun was

⁵⁸ MHEZ, 6.

⁵⁹ MHEZ, 6.

⁶⁰ Mainly through the work of Baltazar Adam Krčelić, *Povijest stolne crkve Zagrebačke*, Zagreb, 1994, the work written in the 18th century, partly relying on earlier, 16th century authors, and very often on unreliable readings of medieval source material; see remarks in S. ANTOLJAK, *Hrvatska historiografija*, Zagreb, 2004, 228-230.

⁶¹ For Andrew III's donations and interventions to the chapter, see CD VII, doc. 78, pp. 96-97; doc. 119, pp. 140.

⁶² MHEZ, 112.

⁶³ MHEZ, 6.

⁶⁴ For Topusko see A. NEKIĆ, *op. cit.* (n. 1), pp. 26-31, and the literature quoted there.

⁶⁵ M. ANČIĆ, *Hrvatsko kraljevstvo u doba anžuvinske vlasti*, (forthcoming).

⁶⁶ CD VI, doc. 548, pp. 652-653.

the bishop's castellan of Medvedgrad and Blaguša in 1290.⁶⁷ If we are to judge by these examples, John was in (financial) troubles already at the beginning of his office, trying to solve them on his own, but also lending money, only to end by fully relying on Grdun, and thus also on the Babonići. What this shows above all is also how fragile his position was in a situation where he had to rely on such support. In June 1291 Grdun came to the royal court and Andrew III issued a charter on this occasion, in which it was stated that Grdun handed over Medvedgrad, which was in his custody, to the king.⁶⁸ Grdun's connections to the bishop of Zagreb and his role as the bishop's officer were omitted. Losing Medvedgrad was, as we have seen above, in fact the main thing that the posterity remembered and emphasized about John's office. Although it was too late, it is not surprising that John tried to pull himself out of the Babonići's hold. There are few indications for this.

John had unresolved business with Radoslav Babonić concerning estate Hrastovica, which the former requested already from the bishop Anthony, and the case was finally settled in September 1292. The estate, which the Church held ever since the time of Bishop Philip (1247-1262) who had bought it, was now lost for John, and although he got 230 marks, the long process of litigation indicates that he fought for the estate and not the money.⁶⁹ John had problems defending Church estates from different directions also. Especially vulnerable were the estates around Vaška, which were the farthest from the core of other church possessions, and which were devastated and depopulated during these turbulent times. The bishop responded by giving these lands to certain nobles to hold them as church *prediales*. This was probably the case with St. Martin near Vaška, which was in September/October given to nobles with whom the bishop previously litigated about the estate borders.⁷⁰ Another estate near Vaška, Gvešće, was given in a similar manner to Stephen Moslavački, member of a distinguished noble family who had a family estate in the vicinity.⁷¹ The bishop gave another estate, Lubena in the Čazma county, to Salomon, son of Gozo.⁷² What these last two donations, and presumably the first one mentioned, have in common is a clause that in the case of infidelity or ingratitude the estates were to revert to the bishop.⁷³ Fidelity and loyalty were thus primary occupations in those uncertain times. It is instructive to compare this to the charter registering Grdun's case. Although even then, as the case of Ugrin shows, loyalty was of utmost importance, we do not find

⁶⁷ For Medvedgrad and Blaguša see CD VI, doc. 584, p. 693. Some of Croatian historians have added Garić to these two, coming to Grdun either in the form of alleged sales transition or that he also held it as a castellan, L. DOBRONIĆ, *op. cit.* (n. 3), p. 85, Krešimir Regan, Plemički grad Garić, *Radovi Zavoda za znanstvenoistraživački i umjetnički rad u Bjelovaru*, 4, Bjelovar, 2011, p. 26, and the literature quoted there. However, the source they were referring to (CD VI, doc. 548, pp. 652-653) says nothing of the kind; the mistake should again be seen as uncritical following of Krčelić's writing who speaks of a sale of Garić for 30 marks, misreading the very same charter which he for certain had in hands, B. A. KRČELIĆ, 1994, p. 112.

⁶⁸ CD VII, doc. 30, pp. 35-36: „qui quidem propter sue fidelitatis insignia castrum Medve, quod idem conservabat, nostre tradidit maiestati”. It is impossible to say under whose control the castle was after this date. The first information comes from January 1295; when we see the castle controlled by Andrew III's men, brothers Torust; from the relevant charter it can be seen that Nicolaus and Janinus Torust have been at the post for some time, but it is impossible to establish for how long with more precision; for Torust brothers see N. KLAJČ, *op. cit.* (n. 6), pp. 53-55, although one cannot rely on her chronology due to bad datation of several charters.

⁶⁹ CD VII, doc. 88, pp. 106-107.

⁷⁰ This act is registered in the charter issued by the chapter of Pécs; the mention that the estate was given under specific "*condicionibus seu sub condicionum articulis et pactis*" leaves no doubt they received it as *prediales*, CD VII, doc. 90, pp. 109-110.

⁷¹ For the family see Zrinka Nikolić Jakus, Obitelj Čupor Moslavački, *Radovi Zavoda za znanstvenoistraživački i umjetnički rad u Bjelovaru*, 4, Bjelovar, 2011, pp. 269-300.

⁷² CD VII, doc. 146, pp. 166-167.

⁷³ "si in infidelitatis vel ingratitude vicium incidere contigerit, quod non optamus, cadere debebunt a iure terre emirate nullo unquam tempore ad eandem reuersari".

this clause in John's charter to Grdun. It could be thus concluded then that the case of Medvedgrad had a sobering effect, and that afterwards this clause was inserted in contracts concerning *prediales*. It would thus also indirectly confirm the bishop's distancing from the Babonići.

The way that the anonymous writer of the "List" depicted John's time is instructive: while his predecessor and successor, regardless of how successful they were, are presented in active terms, John was presented as a passive figure. While Timothy could rely on the king at certain moments, and on fellow prelates at others, John appears as a lonesome figure, entrapped in local circumstances. It could have been due to the fact that as a local provost and then bishop he did not develop a wide network among ecclesiastical circles. Even more so it could be due to the fact that this period was a time when oligarchs, like the Babonići, were strengthening their grip over more rounded territories, and this hold was more and more hard to escape from.

MICHAEL (1296-1303)

Despite the fact that Andrew III's reign was anything but strong when it comes to Slavonia, he still succeeded to have his candidate elected for the post of the bishop of Zagreb after John's death. This guaranteed that the king had a faithful man with significant resources in Slavonia. Michael from kindred Bő was elected on Andrew's suggestion. Michael's pro-royal network consisted of important ecclesiastics, royal officials and family members, which enabled him to quickly advance in life due to these connections. Before his election Michael was the provost of the chapter in Alba Iula, where his cousin, the bishop of Transylvania, Peter Monoszló, placed him in 1387. Seven years later his brother Peter was given the post of *comes Siculorum* by Andrew III, a clear sign where Michael's family political alliance laid.⁷⁴ Michael was also *comes* of Garić and Garešnica between 1297 and 1303, and chancellor of the king's uncle Albert Morosini, honors and offices that he obviously held with Andrew's full support. He did not have experiences like Timothy, in which changes at the court politics significantly affected his real control of Church's various resources.⁷⁵ That does not mean there were not any threats, quite the opposite. Being the king's only serious supporter in Slavonia meant that he could expect serious clashes with the Kőszegis and the Babonići, and the anonymous writer of "The List" was certainly not wrong when he wrote that Michael defended his Church with arms to the best of his abilities.⁷⁶

Michael's charter from January 1299 reveals that, in opposition to the king, Henrik Kőszegi attacked the chapter's possession, *liberam villam Čazma*, causing significant damage to the Church.⁷⁷ Two among those who were fighting on that occasion *sub vexillo* of Henrik Kőszegi, George and Matthew, sons of Gregory, were the bishop's *prediales*, and because of their unfaithful acts their estates were taken from them. In order to placate the bishop and return to the grace of their lord and mother, the church of Zagreb, both gave to the bishop their share of rights in the possession Međurječje.⁷⁸ Two months later quite a number of George's and Matthew's cousins conducted another transaction with the bishop who was represented by the lector of the cathedral chapter of Zagreb, on which occasion they asserted that they ended up in poverty and famine because of the frequent devastation of *depredatorum regni*, which they survived thanks to the bishop's help. To compensate the bishop, they gave him their rights to the estate Međurječje.⁷⁹ We see a similar pattern to Timothy's transactions

⁷⁴ Andrea Fara, *La formazione di un'economia di frontiera: La Transilvania tra il XII e XIV secolo*, Naples, 2010, pp. 202-203.

⁷⁵ For his titles see A. ZSOLDOS, *op. cit.* (n. 6), pp. 153-154.

⁷⁶ "Cum armis defendabat in quantum poterat ecclesiam suam", MHEZ, 6.

⁷⁷ CD VII, doc. 284, pp. 327-328.

⁷⁸ CD VII, doc. 284, pp. 327.

⁷⁹ CD VII, doc. 288, pp. 330-331.

with the members of the Ača kindred, when they were likewise supported by the bishop in rough times, returning the favor by giving up their estates. This meant that the bishop was enlarging the Church's land resources and also spreading in general his influence among the lesser nobility that was impoverished and threatened.

In the same year Bishop Michael gave the estate *Gulynci* in the Ivanić county to Ugrin. Michael emphasized that Ugrin was faithful to the Church and to the bishops of Zagreb, which is then contrasted with the example of Grdun who is "*hostis et tyrannus notorius dei ac predictae sanctae matris ecclesiae Zagrabiensis grauissimus persecutor*". Thus, in ten years the situation completely reversed, Ugrin who proved disloyal to John⁸⁰ was presented as a staunch church's supporter by Michael, and Grdun, obviously as a consequence of relinquishing the control over Medvedgrad, was depicted as the worst enemy of the Church. In 1299 this was also symbolically reversed in the transfer of estate which was then returned to Ugrin and which John had previously given to Grdun.

Grdun's relations with Michael can be seen as a reflection of the bishop's relations with the Babonići, which fluctuated depending on the family's relations with Andrew III. These underwent significant changes in the period between 1299 and 1300. The change came during the problematic years for King Andrew III as his position was seriously weakened by the aristocracy from within and threats of an invasion from a pretender from Naples. As a result, Andrew decided to reaffirm his rule by approaching the rebel oligarchs, including the Babonići. This rapprochement severely diminished the power of the bishop of Zagreb, and shows another option how church institutions might have come under the influence of oligarchs and thus deserves closer investigation.

The best starting point for the discussion is the agreement between the Babonići and Michael from May 1300 by which the bishop gave up much of his power into the hands of the Babonići. Besides some concessions of territory, the bishop practically obliged himself to help them in all the cases when they were threatened, except when the threat came from the king himself, although even in such a case the bishop was to help them by interceding at the royal court in the favour of the Babonići.⁸¹ The last clause hints at the possibility that the king approved of this deal, something which has never been addressed before. This option can be corroborated by the two royal charters issued on 1 August 1299. In the first charter the king conferred the title of *ducatu totius Sclavonie* and the county of Požega to Albert Morosini, while the second one records the returning of the Babonići to the royal grace, on which occasion Stephen Babonić was given the honor of *banus totius Sclavonie*, which Albert also confirmed.⁸² These decisions signaled the attempt by the king at a reorganization of power in Slavonia that were intended to boost his authority. Still, in May 1300, when the Babonić signed the agreement with Michael, no one among them had the title of ban, which suggests that something happened in the meantime that redefined their relations. This is confirmed by the charter of Albert Morosini from June 1300 where we can see that the Babonići sent him letters informing him about their deal with the king, and Albert confirming this deal. The expressions – help, protection – that Albert uses are pretty much reminiscent of the ones seen in the agreement between Michael and the Babonići.⁸³ This is another confirmation, besides the time overlap, that the Babonići made the deal with the king before May 1300, and that it included a redefinition of their position in Slavonia, the relationship towards the bishopric being one of the most important segments. We can place this change in the context of wider attempts of the king to come to terms with the oligarchs of the Kingdom. Between 1298 and

⁸⁰ This was the same Ugrin, as testified by Michael's statement that Ugrin served the Church for a very long time ("*in operibus sumpme fidelitatis ab antiquo sancte matri Zagrabiensi ecclesie ac nostris predecessoribus demumque nostre assistens persone indefesse studuit laborare*" CD VII, doc. 313, pp. 359-360.

⁸¹ CD VII, doc. 343, pp. 389-390, H. KEKEZ, *op. cit.* (n. 31), pp. 112-113.

⁸² CD VII, doc. 304-305, pp. 350-353.

⁸³ L. THALLÓCZY – S. BARABÁS, *A Blagay-család oklevéltára. Codex diplomaticus comitum de Blagay*, Budapest 1897, doc. 33, pp. 69-70.

1300 the king concluded agreements with the strongest nobles in the kingdom, turning to the method of cooperation, if possible, rather than confrontation. The agreement nevertheless demanded a strong renunciation of the king's authority, as can be seen in the inflation of the palatine post: there were seven of them in the first decade of the fourteenth century.⁸⁴ If the Babonići were not eager to obtain the title of ban – it can be supposed that it was offered to Henrik Jr. Kőszegi at the same time – that did not mean they were without requests.⁸⁵ They concentrated instead on obtaining the royal approval to put the bishopric of Zagreb quite openly in their sphere of interest, showing another way – with the support of the king himself – how a bishop might come under the influence of the oligarchs.

Time prevented Andrew III from testing how efficient his new method of dealing with oligarchs was, as he died in January 1301, and these new circumstance found Michael aligned with the papal and the Angevin interests, which would bring him the post of archbishop of Esztergom in 1303.⁸⁶ Rising from the post of provost to the very top of the church hierarchy in the kingdom was a remarkable feat, and it speaks of Michael's skills, connections and his ability to use both. What the Slavonian experience brought to him were the skills necessary for operating in a violent context, where preservation and protection of his diocese was to a large degree a matter resolved through the clash of arms. Whether there was too much pressure on ecclesiastical resources he controlled is hard to ascertain, but fighting with the oligarchs at one point proved too much for Andrew III, with serious consequences for Michael.

CONCLUSION

The present analysis shows a variety of ways in which the four bishops of Zagreb interacted with the royal court, local oligarchs, prelates of the kingdom, the cathedral chapter, and the middling/lower nobility. To understand the world of these bishops is to understand the dynamics of political circumstances which were shaped by a growing localization of power assumed by the oligarchs at the expense of the last members of the Arpad dynasty. Still, even with these political trends in mind, it is obvious that the royalist stance of the bishops did not significantly change. The only exception to this is John, while for Michael it is understandable that he stood by his patron until the very end. Timothy's case stands out, since he still operated in a mindscape of expectations that came under threat as the royal authority was waning, and furthermore the prelates found themselves on the side opposing Ladislaus IV. Besides that, resources and rights of his church were even threatened by one of the members of the royal dynasty, the queen mother Elizabeth. This theme, although with different villains, is something that all the bishops considered here had in common, since all of them had to fight off encroachments on their rights and possessions. This came as a consequence of pure violence, which the period abounded with, through help that ended up as an appropriation (Bishop John and Grdun), and through conscious relinquishing that came as a part of a political deal (Michael in the context of the negotiations between Andrew III and the Babonići). Among the mechanism these bishops used to defend their see, Timothy stands out as the only one who used spiritual sanctions, which can be seen as a reflection of a specific moment, a tide that was caused by the activities of the legate Philip, that is a political moment in which the prelates were each other's main support. Still, no matter which mechanism they employed, it is obvious that it was hard for the bishops to protect their church and its resources against the oligarchs, as numerous examples presented here suggest.

⁸⁴ A. ZSOLDOS, *op. cit.* (n. 1), pp. 231-233.

⁸⁵ The first decade of the 14th century shows that for the Babonići obtaining the title of ban may have even become redundant, A. NEKIĆ, *The Oligarchs and the King in Medieval Slavonia, 1301-1342, Südost-Forschungen*, 74, Regensburg, 2015, pp. 9-12.

⁸⁶ Mišo Petrović, *Papal power, local communities and pretenders: the Church of Croatia, Dalmatia and Slavonia and the struggle for the throne of the Kingdom of Hungary-Croatia (1290-1301)*, *Banatica* 26, Cluj-Napoca, 2016, p. 28.

U obrani svoje biskupije – zagrebački biskupi (1272.-1301.)

Posljednja četvrtina 13. stoljeća u Ugarsko-Hrvatskom Kraljevstvu obilježena je slabljenjem kraljevskog autoriteta zadnjih dvaju vladara dinastije Arpadovića, Ladislava IV. (1272.-1290.) i Andrije III. (1290.-1301.). Usporedno s time rasla je moć obitelji i pojedinaca koje se ustalilo nazivati oligarsima, a oni su, zajedno s borbom za prevlast na dvoru, postupno oblikovali teritorijalne oblasti koje su podvrgavali svojoj sve snažnijoj kontroli. U takvim političkim okolnostima slabila je i tradicionalno snažna moć i utjecaj koji su Arpadovići imali nad crkvenim institucijama, naročito nadbiskupijama i biskupijama, a sve su istaknutiji bili i pokušaji oligarha da, na vrlo različite načine, prošire svoj utjecaj nad crkvenim institucijama na teritoriju pod njihovom dominacijom.

U ovom radu Zagrebačka biskupija uzima se kao studija slučaja kako bi se sagledalo kako su između 1272. i 1301. godine zagrebački biskupi djelovali u toj nestabilnoj političkoj situaciji, s kakvim su se opasnostima susretali i na koje su načine nastojali na njih odgovoriti. Riječ je o temi koja nije dobila odveć pozornosti u hrvatskoj medievistici, budući da je jedino Lelja Dobronić do sada o tome nešto pisala. Rad je organiziran kronološki te sagledava kako su djelovala četiri zagrebačka biskupa u mreži aktera koju su sačinjavali kraljevski dvor, (lokalni) oligarsi, prelati kraljevstva, katedralni kapitol te slavonsko srednje i niže plemstvo.

Još od utemeljenja Zagrebačka je biskupija snažno vezana uz dinastiju, tj. uz kraljevski dvor. To se pokazuje i na primjeru prvoga od ovdje analiziranih biskupa, Timoteja. Bez obzira na sukobe s kraljicom majkom Elizabetom, ali očito i sa samim kraljem Ladislavom, te bez obzira na to što je kraljev autoritet u razdoblju do 1284. godine bio značajno narušen, on je i dalje djelovao u mentalnom krajobrazu u kojem je kralj smatran utjelovljenjem političkog reda, i to ne samo na teorijskoj, već i na praktičnoj razini. Vidljivo je to i iz Timotejeve, kako se može shvatiti, značajne uloge u proglašenju tada petnaestogodišnjeg Ladislava punoljetnim, na Rakoškom polju u svibnju 1277. godine, u pokušaju da se okončaju dvorske frakcijske borbe te da se predavanjem vlasti samom kralju zavede red u kraljevstvu.

Za razliku od njega, biskup Ivan – Antonijev mandat je trajao prekratko da bi se o njemu moglo nešto više reći – potpuno je drukčija figura. Budući da je bio lokalni prepošt koji se uspeo na biskupsku stolicu, njegova društvena mreža bila je izrazito lokalna, te se u početku u obrani svoje biskupije oslonio na Baboniće i njihove ljude, što se već 1291. godine pokazalo kao dvostruki mač. Gubitak Medvedgrada, koji je u ruke crkve 1273. vratio Timotej, bio je od presudne važnosti, te je po tome Ivan i ostao zapamćen u krugovima zagrebačke Crkve. Nakon toga, Ivan se izgleda pokušao distancirati od Babonića, no oskudnost izvornog materijala ne dopušta više zaključaka o toj tematici. Njegov nasljednik Mihovil bio je kraljevski čovjek, moglo bi se reći i posljednji kraljevski oslonac u Slavoniji. To je pred njega stavljalo izazove koji su se većinom rješavali snagom oružja jer su crkveni resursi bili meta kako Babonića tako i Kőszega (Gisingovaca). No, sam kraj Andrijine vladavine donio je i neočekivan obrat, kada je kralj u sklopu pokušaja učvršćivanja svoje vlasti, ukoliko se to uopće može tako nazvati, Babonićima zapravo prepustio Zagrebačku biskupiju kao sferu utjecaja, što je bio još jedan od načina kako su oligarsi ovladavali crkvenim institucijama.

Ključne riječi: *zagrebački biskupi, Ladislav IV., Andrija III., oligarsi, Babonići, Kőszegi, Ugarsko-Hrvatsko Kraljevstvo, 13. stoljeće*