

Eötvös Loránd University  
Faculty of Arts  
Doctoral School of History  
Auxiliary Sciences of History

DOCTORAL DISSERTATION

**ENIKŐ SPEKNER**

THE FORMATION OF THE ROYAL SEAT IN BUDA'S IN THE 13<sup>TH</sup> AND 14<sup>TH</sup> CENTURIES

Budapest

2010

## Preface

The dissertation examines the formation of the royal seat in (Ó)buda and Buda (founded after the Mongolian invasion in 1241–1242) from the beginnings in the late 12th century onwards to the end of the reign of King Charles I in 1342. The date of the inception does not require any justification; references unanimously appoint this to the end of the reign of King Béla III and the beginning of the reign of his son, Emeric. The other time limit of the research selected by the author of this dissertation was, however, motivated by the limits of the extent, as well as by the fact that, by that time, the structure of relations became more palpable, which made the fruition of the evolution of Buda into a permanent royal seat only a matter of time dating to the end of the age of King Louis I the Great and the beginning of the period of King Sigismund.

The research history of the royal seat in Óbuda and Buda constituted part of the urban history essay, and it was less represented as an individual theme concerning primarily the early period. The scope of questions can be approached from many aspects ranging from the research of residences<sup>1</sup> to the scrutiny concerning the royal court and the content and operation of the royal household, or even to the investigation regarding the outward forms of the royal court's culture. This dissertation is intended to depict the development processes, the superimposition and the alterations of the particular royal seats in a governmental historic point of view.

This dissertation, as has already been mentioned, makes efforts to comprehensively portray the theme it focuses on via a governmental approach by the application of source analysis methods, and of archontology, and of the results of the royal itinerariums and of sphragistics, and whereas any insufficiency was identified in concern to the bibliography of avail, by the application of particular addendums to such insufficiencies (for instance, by the completion of the annual itinerarium of King Charles I (1323–1342), or the research on the seal application of the royal and palatine diplomas, etc.). The author pursued answers to the following questions: when and for what reasons did (Ó)buda, having developed into the third center of the *medium regni*, mature into a royal seat? When and under what circumstances was it relocated to Buda? Did Óbuda and Buda exist as parallel centers? Did Buda and Óbuda have such governmental capacities and structure of relations connected to the royal court subsequent to the cessation of Buda's function as a seat in 1314 and posteriorly the transfer of the seat to Visegrád, which predicted the outset of the permanent royal residence in Buda afterwards?

As regards the utilization of the sources in concern to the 13<sup>th</sup> century, the book of Albert Gárdonyi titled *Budapest történetének okleveles emlékei* [Monumenta Diplomatica Historiae Budapestinensis] that is based on Dezső Csánki's collection, as well as the data collection in Volume IV. of György Györffy's book titled *Az Árpád-kori Magyarország történeti földrajza* [The historic geography of Hungary in the Árpadian Age] concerning Óbuda and Buda were primarily used. The appropriate volumes of the *Anjoukori Okmánytár* [Codex diplomaticus Hungaricus Adegavensis] and the *Anjou-kori Oklevéltár* supplemented with the material found in the Archives of Diplomas and Charters and the Photographic Collection of pre-1526 Documents of the National

---

<sup>1</sup> The dissemination of the science of "Rezidenzforschung" in Hungary that originates in German territories represented a relevant part of ANDRÁS KUBINYI's lifework. He turned the attention of the public to this theme for the first time in 1992 in his work written in German: *Residenz- und Herrschaftsbildung in Ungarn in der zweiten Hälfte des 15. Jahrhunderts und am Beginn des 16. Jahrhunderts*. In: *Vorträge und Forschungen*. Hrsg. von Hans Patze und Werner Paravicini. XXXVI. Sigmaringen. 1991. 421–452. His first work published in Hungarian includes a recapitulation of his research work completed abroad: *Főváros, rezidencia és egyházi intézmények*. [Capital, residence, and Church institutions.] In: *Magyar Egyháztörténeti Évkönyv. Annales Historiae Ecclesiae Hungaricae* 1. 1994. 57–70. The summary of his works and other foreign bibliography: *KÁROLY MAGYAR: A budai középkori királyi palota építészeti együttesének változásai (1340–1440) európai kitekintésben*. [The Changing Architectural Faces of the Mediaeval Royal Palace at Buda (1340–1440) with an Outlook to Europe.] Doctoral dissertation. Manuscript. Budapest 2007. 22–28.

Archives of Hungary concerning the unpublished years guaranteed a relevant insight to the sources of the 14<sup>th</sup> century. For the purpose of executing the itinerarium of King Charles I, brief recapitulations, which have been published in separate archives, were concluded based on the aforementioned sources, publications, and the author's own data collection in concern to the royal diplomas indicating their dating places. In addition, the sources of the 14<sup>th</sup> century concerning the Palatine and Vice-palatine royal assizes, as well as other documents representing the undertakings and functions of the Judge Royal (*iudex curiae*) in Buda and its vicinity in the 14<sup>th</sup> century have been included in a table.

As regards the bibliography of the early period, chiefly the oeuvres of György Györffy and Bernát L. Kumorovitz were taken into account, in addition to which the studies of Géza Érszegi, József Gerics, Erik Fügedi, László Solymosi, and Attila Zsoldos concerning particular areas of the theme were also respected. The creations of Júlia Altmann and Vilmosné Bertalan provided guidance for the archaeological excavations of Óbuda, and Krisztina Havas performed the most recent art historic analysis of the reminiscences of the royal palace in Óbuda.

György Györffy and András Kubinyi carried out fundamental research on Buda founded by King Béla IV in the middle of the 13<sup>th</sup> century and on the history of Óbuda dating to the Late Árpadian Age. Their treatises were supplemented with the productions of Erik Fügedi, Jenő Szűcs, and Attila Zsoldos. The essential processing of the archaeological excavations of the palace in Buda was published by László Gerevich, László Zolnay, and Károly Magyar, whilst András Végh accomplished its topographical monograph.

The essence of the section herein to depict Buda in the 14<sup>th</sup> century is crucially grounded on the treatises of Iván Bertényi, Pál Engel, and Gyula Kristó, which have been supplemented with the essays of Pál Engel's colleague, Enikő Csukovits, and of the members of the Szegedi Középkorász Műhely [Workshop of Mediaeval Studies in Szeged], and of Gyula Kristó's students, primarily of Tibor Almási, and of Ferenc Piti and Ildikó Tóth who represent the younger generation, which essays were created as a result of their research activities hearteningly animated in the past one and a half decades principally encouraged by the publication efforts of the Anjou Age Diploma Archives.

Pál Engel's version forms the ground for the completion of the itinerarium of King Charles I as regards the two first decades of his command, which has been re-assessed on the basis of the most recently published data of the diploma archives and of Gyula Kristó's comments considered as genuine by the author of this dissertation. The itinerarium of the subsequent two decades was individually prepared by the author by the application of the editing of Károly Ráth, Béla Sebestyén, and Ferdo Šišić. Nonetheless, vast majority of the author's exertion was to rectify their extraordinary inaccuracies and misunderstandings giving way to each other's errors, which the author of this dissertation was to accomplish and revise contingent upon her own data and material collection. Publicizing and assessing the bibliography of the aforesaid itinerarium was redundant, because Richárd Horváth already reviewed these in the introduction of his already publicized manuscript of his monograph concerning the itinerarium of King Matthias Corvinus and Queen Beatrice of Aragon.<sup>2</sup>

The presentation of the Vice Judge Royal and Judge Royal of Óbuda and Buda is rested on József Gerics' essays and Iván Bertényi's still fundamental monographic processing of the 14<sup>th</sup> century history of the institution of the Judge Royals. As regards the events of palatinate jurisdiction in Óbuda and Buda, only Lajos Nyers' publication from 1934 could have been used, because no modern processing of this theme has been available.

The author's own research, which is to be discussed below, further supplements the bibliography listed above.

Grounded on the still fundamental research of Bernát L. Kumorovitz, the term of *medium regni*, id est the center of the homeland, includes the unity of administrative and governmental

---

<sup>2</sup> Horváth, Richárd: *Itineraria regis Matthiae Corvini et reginae Beatricis de Aragonia (1458–[1476]–1490). Itinerarium regum et reginarum Regni Hungariae II.* Manuscript. Budapest 2010.

centers located in the heart, to say in the center, of the country, which were easy to approach for both the residents on their missions to manage their affairs and the itinerant king who was mobile with his court in the Árpadian Age, when he frequently visited his residence(s) furnished by him as his central site(s) during particular periods of the year. The following centers, located approximately triangularly, were chronologically founded respectively: Esztergom, directly prior to the epoch of the establishment of the Hungarian Kingdom, Fehérvár instituted by St. Stephen, and posteriorly Óbuda in the 12<sup>th</sup> to 13<sup>th</sup> centuries, which cluster Visegrád joined in the second decade of the 14<sup>th</sup> century. In mediaeval times, these hubs existed not only after one another, but also parallelly with specific function alterations jointly performing their secular and ecclesiastical central administrative and governmental duties.

Although the location of (Ó)buda, which has outstandingly good environmental conditions at the meeting of the plainly and mountainous regions nearby the Danube River along with the fords of the aforesaid river, was more central than any of its predecessors or "seat associates", it did not become an administrative (county) or a clerical (episcopal) center as occurred in case of Esztergom and Fehérvár. To add, the previous statement is not fully true in case of the previous two towns, because Esztergom did not metamorphose into an early bailiff center, and no episcopate was set up in Fehérvár. This phenomenon that can be identified in case of (Ó)buda was quite frequent within the Árpáds' private domains, where their seats came into being. A further root cause of the fact that neither a secular, nor an ecclesiastical administrative headquarters was organized in (Ó)buda should, in the author's opinion, be investigated among the weaknesses of its defensibility. Thus, it is no longer a coincidence that the Hungarian rulers envisaged the conversion of their seats only in the consolidated periods of the foreign and internal affairs at the end of the 12<sup>th</sup> century and in the beginning of the 13<sup>th</sup> century. Additional reason is that Buda, the other commodious royal domain, was located between two well-defendable royal centers, to say in their route. Therefore, nothing justified the appreciation of it until fresh circumstances triggered doing so.

Researchers already took notice of the fact that, compared to the national average, a strikingly high number of early, royally founded private chapels were located in the vicinity of Buda, to which royal mansions were presumably linked that were in charge of arranging the activities of the royal service staff in service of them. If one takes a thorough look at the system of these chapels (Fehéregyháza, Óbuda, Szentjakabfalva, Nyék, Alkeszi, Felkeszi, Buda, Kispest {Saint Gerard}, Sasad {Saint Andrew}, Örs {Saint Martin} Csík), one can find that an immense preponderance of them (except for Keszi and Nyék) were positioned along the route connecting Esztergom and Fehérvár. Their number can be explained by that, according to their original province, they ensured the connection between the two aforesaid hubs until Óbuda, and ulteriorly Buda were transformed into seats.

Subsequent to the establishment of the Hungarian Kingdom, the territory of Buda, owing to its benevolent location, acquired the most significant relevance as regards the connection between Fehérvár and Esztergom by the increase in the role of Fehéregyháza, a royal mansion of (Ó)buda connected to the early royal chapel, which was indicated by the foundation of the Buda Provostship at the end of the thirties of the 11<sup>th</sup> century that was situated on the remains of a Late Roman legion camp fortress on the Buda side of the current Árpád Bridge.

This ecclesiastical institution secured its increasing weight as a consequence of the benefactions of St. Ladislaus (1077–1095) and Géza II (1141–1162). Its provost, Hadrian was appointed as the principal of the royal chancellery, a central administrative organization set up under the monarchy of King Béla III (1172–1196), by which the connection between the royal court and this collegiate chapter of (Ó)buda was strengthened. Another progress to be associated with the rule of King Béla III at the same time is that the onset of the evolution of the royal residence in Óbuda can be dated to this period. This statement can be surprising in light of the fact that the palace of Esztergom to be affiliated with his name was built during that time; nonetheless, many considerations allow us to extrapolate the above statement. We have firm knowledge of that King Béla I invited Frederick I Barbarossa, the Holy Roman Emperor to hunting also in Óbuda besides Esztergom, which fact itself does not imply that a notable royal facility should on this site be taken

into account. The record of chronicler Anonymus, or *Bele Regis notarius* ("unnamed notary of Béla") on the castle of Buda appears to represent a much more appreciable clincher, which he referred to Attila the Hun, yet it can only be understood in concern to his own age. According to this, the king had only one seat (*regalem locum*) built over the spot of the thermal waters adjacent to the Danube River by the renovation of the old buildings (i.e. Roman ruins) found there, and ulteriorly the whole complex was surrounded by an extremely robust wall, which was called Budavár in Hungarian and "Ecilburg" in German. Since King Emeric, albeit with reservations, but endowed the unfinished palace of Esztergom with the archbishop in 1198, it can be assumed that the royal castle of (Ó)buda described by Anonymus was finished in the time of his father, King Béla III, because it is not to be confused with the succeeding royal, and followingly queenly castle built outside the walls of the Late Roman fortress during the ascendancy of King Andrew II. Grounded on Attila Zsoldos' research on Fehérvár, and due to a contemplation of that the structural complex of the collegiate chapter above was also located between the walls of the Late Roman fortress, i.e. the walls of the castle reported by Anonymus, it is conceivable that the two institutions were not at all separated, and that the Provostship hosted the royal facility, or at least these lived in symbiosis.

After that, this dissertation explicitly analyzes the polemics of György Györffy and Bernát L. Kumorovitz in respect to the authenticity of the sources reporting the royal castle of Óbuda having existed in the age of King Andrew II, as well as concerning the interpretation of its operation to be expounded, from time to time, as steady or interrupted. This paper also advocates the notion that abandoning the royal seat in Esztergom, and additionally the establishment of the new residence in Óbuda, and consequently the construction of the royal castle in the period of King Andrew II must have been in correlation with the initiation of the new county administration model conducted within the territory. Óbuda, at the outset of the dominion of King Béla IV, undoubtedly fulfilled the first place in the line of the royal headquarters. For such purpose, the establishment of the new castle (town) of Buda subsequent to the Mongol invasion of Hungary brought paramount changes.

## **2. The establishment of the new castle (town) of Buda and the matter of the royal residence**

Whether there were royal quarters in the castle (town) established by King Béla IV on the Castle Hill, and if yes, where were they located provoked a spry debate among historians and archaeologists in the 1950s and 1960s. The participants in the so-called "Debate on Buda" were unable to agree on which part of the Castle Hill was apt to position such quarters: the southern or the northern side? For instance, György Györffy straightforwardly doubted the existence of them, and he only considered Óbuda as the royal residence in the Árpáadian Age. The discourse followed a specific method in the course of the examination, namely it examined one by one the objects established by the king in the castle of Buda and the royal measures concerning the town. Therefore, the Church of Our Lady having royal chapel origins, the foundation history of the succeeding urban parish, the nascence of the Dominican monastery, the determination of the function of the "old royal house" a.k.a. *Kammerhof*, the circumstances of the birth of the István Tower were canvassed, and further investigations were conducted in relation to the specific actions taken for minting, which had existed only in Esztergom before, and which was part of the royal prerogative and was also transferred to Buda by that time, as well as in relation to the establishment of the institution of the Buda rectorate. In the course of the meticulous evaluation of the sources concerning the objects, this dissertation concluded that even though concrete sources and/or archaeological artifacts are of no avail to unequivocally confirm the antecedent existence of the royal quarters in Buda, the system of the particular royal buildings and deeds bolstering each other seem to verify, indirectly, the royal central character of the newly established town. According to this logical thread, what sort of a relationship existed between the new castle of Buda and the royal central character of the old castle of Buda having been called increasingly more popularly as Óbuda from 1261 onwards must have been scrutinized after all.

### 3. Óbuda and Buda as royal residences in the Late Árpadian Age

The names of Óbuda and Buda slowly fixed except at the royal chancellery. The royal recording authority sc. further used the term of *datum Bude* consistently - which handled the territory uniformly, but was otherwise completely logical rested on the historic root causes presented - in the date line of the royal diplomas, which otherwise would allow to extrapolate the approximate place(s) of residence of the issuer of the actual diploma, but this enigma of dating has placed the generations of scholars to come desiring to elucidate every facet in an insolvable dilemma. The localization definitions of *in Veteri Buda* or *in castro Budensi* scarcely appear, and only once in case of each of the forthcoming sovereigns of the Árpáds. The decision on the actual venue of the royal center becomes critical as regards the second half of the hegemony of King Andrew III, because he permanently resided in (Ó)buda that was transformed into a nearly permanent seat irrespective of the aforesaid king's three detours in Western Hungary and four of these in Esztergom. Whether to place the permanent royal residence in Óbuda or Buda divided the team of competent researchers into two, nearly conflicting groups. According to György Györffy's already cited point of view, he referred all of the Buda dating of King Andrew III to Óbuda, and he also marked the king's and queen's quarters in the royal palace of Óbuda. Having assumed the existence of the southern royal palace on the Castle Hill, László Gerevich and his team, and posteriorly through their motivation András Kubinyi, already attributed a plurality of the *Datum Bude* dating to the castle by considering the appearance of the term of *Vetus Buda* after 1261, despite they concluded permanent residence there only in the period of King Andrew III. Pros and contras can be voiced in favor of and against both concepts. Reviewing the difficulties created by the denominations in correlation with the potentate's measures concerning the two towns might bring some relevant upshot in respect to this insoluble vicissitude that in fact cannot ever be solved doubtlessly. Frankly, in cases of permanently itinerant kings, it is no longer vital to decide whether the king and his court actually arrived in Óbuda or Buda that both equally belonged to the Buda center, which the residents living in those days probably did not bother to tell apart, insomuch as the royal chancellery deemed it unnecessary to distinguish them. The situation, on the other hand, in respect to the second half of the sway of King Andrew III essentially varies, because the venues of the royal residences that appear to have become permanent must after all be defined. It seems that the dating of his diplomas and his actions taken in the first half of his supremacy rather hint his visits to the Óbuda center according to the traditional order. The second half of his power, however, reveals few, but weighted data that make the transfer of the seat from Óbuda to Buda more likely after all. The latter conclusion, however, can only be made with complete certainty in respect to the command of the Bohemian King, Wenceslaus III Premyslid, who started the line of the Late Mediaeval Hungarian rulers subsequent to the extinction of the Árpáds.

## II. King Charles I and Buda

### 1. Struggle for the throne (1301–1310)

Researchers share the view in general that Buda eventually matured into the center of the Hungarian Kingdom as has been evidently and relevantly proven by the struggle for the throne succeeding the extinction of the Árpáds. On the contrary, there is no such unanimity as regards the judgment of the relation between Buda and King Charles I. The transfer of the royal residence to Visegrád by the king has been explicated by many experts as a punishment against Buda that antagonized him. The postulation of this explication that serves as its firm foundation is, nevertheless, incorrect. The residents of Buda did nothing but capitulated to a sovereign, who was capable of conquering the town, as a consequence of his armed forces and support. King Charles I, in this respect, proceeded the same way as the Bohemian Wenceslaus III Premyslid, or Otto III of Bavaria did; to wit, he occupied the town with his armed forces. Subsequent to the occupation of Buda, King Charles I immediately rushed *in Budensem civitatem nostram principalem*, by which act he procured the control of the entire country – as he announced it by his own words. Subsequent to the unlawful coronation ceremony organized and conducted in 1309 by Cardinal and Papal

Legate Gentile, the residents of the town, as their expression of capitulation, "carried him [the crowned king] on their shoulders and paid him respect as their king", as was chronicled by Gentile. King Charles I had no reason at all to adjudge Buda to be a "guilty" town. He did not give any sign of such judgment, after he had furnished his royal residence in Buda, thus the root cause of his conversion to Visegrád must be explored elsewhere.

## **2. The royal residence of the castle of Buda in the initial years of the control of King Charles I, 1310–1314**

Following the lawful coronation of King Charles I in the fall of 1310, he, likewise his predecessors, furnished his residence at the *Kammerhof* that was later referred to as "the whilom grandiose court of the deceased King Charles, His Majesty". After that the king marched to each of his negotiations and military campaigns from Buda, and he returned to the same place from each of his aforesaid missions. He held royal councils with his barons and prelates there, and he convened the national assemblies there, and the court of special royal presence (Lat. *specialis praesentia regia*) under the control of Judge Royal János (John) of the Csák clan also officiated there. During his war declared on the provincial lords, whose power disrupted the country, which King Charles I longed to unite, the Csáks had allied and Judge Royal János Csák had changed sides, after which they jeopardized the king's life with their combat actions, so that he was forced to surrender his residence and march to the southern lands in order to prepare for the battles to come. No one in those days might have had any clue of that the surrender of Buda, which was regarded as the "capital" of the country at that time, would coerce the town into ceasing to exist as a royal seat with short pauses (1347–1355) for almost one hundred years (1405–1408). This, however, did not imply that the monarch totally neglected Buda, or that all of the governmental responsibilities of Óbuda and Buda were terminated. To prove this has been attempted in the additional chapters.

## **3. Royal residences in Buda in knowledge of the itinerarium of King Charles I, 1315–1342**

The itinerant king commuting in the Szeged–Lippa (Lipova)–Temesvár (Timișoara) triangle between 1315 and 1317 eventually chose Temesvár as his new seat, but soon, after the reoccupation of Komárom and Visegrád from Máté Csák and the reinforcement of the defense along the line of the Danube River, the route to Buda was liberated, thence King Charles I could hold his marriage with Elisabeth Piast of the Polish royal house there in the summer of 1302. The year of 1323 brought the fall of the provincial lords' dominance and the dawn of consolidation, which was betokened by the king's return to the *medium regni*, his selection of Visegrád as the new royal residence, the shift of his royal seal, and his decree to start the minting of the new, permanent value currency. Researchers have failed to identify the best explanation to his selection of Visegrád to date. Many of them referred this puzzle to the cluster of mysterious questions, i.e. why did the king prefer Visegrád, which he scarcely visited until then as opposed to Buda? Having been tormented by the combats, King Charles' desire for security has of course arisen as a good reason, but it is insufficient for a satisfactory explanation. To add, this might have obviously been his chief motivation. Visegrád parallelly offered the option to build the royal mansion on a plain land nearby the Danube River and a citadel guaranteeing defense, whilst the corresponding combination was available for the king in the relation of Óbuda and Buda located farther away from each other. A distinct royal residential area that could have been defended by the king's barons and his armed escort did not exist in Buda in those days, which implied risks no matter how much the monarch relied on his loyal subjects. It might not have been a minor standpoint either that the poorly populated settlement of Visegrád was a more appropriate venue for him to establish his more closed court from his new elite that he could keep under his more befitting control as opposed to the more frequently visited Buda having been exposed to large-scale commotion.

In the third period of his sovereignty, King Charles I resided in Buda for the most part in addition to Visegrád. During the rest of his mastery of eighteen and half years, he did not visit Buda only in four years altogether: in 1327, in 1330, and in 1341–1342, which could be extrapolated from

his itinerarium that can nearly be completed. In four other years, he visited the town many times: thrice in 1325, and twice in 1329, and in 1331 and 1332. Part of his visits lead only to Buda, while on some occasions, he only trespassed the town. The latter events occurred mainly on his way to Nagyvárad (Oradea), where he paid relatively many visits to King St. Ladislaus' tomb. In addition to Nagyvárad, he visited Pozsony (Bratislava) on many occasions, but not for pious reasons, rather because of his military campaigns against the Czechs or Austrians, or for the purpose of concluding peace treaties with them.

#### **4. The jurisdiction of the Palatine and Vice-palatine in Buda and Óbuda**

As a consequence of the establishment of the royal seat in Visegrád, Buda and its neighborhood was not totally severed from government. Prior to the return of the royal seat, the office of the vice-palatine seated in Buda, as soon as it became possible, was reinstated in Buda in May 1322, as the first sign of consolidation, during the palatinate of Dózsa Debreceni (1322), who held his court of justice in Debrecen, which vice-palatine, as the one in charge of the bailiff's duties in Pest county, administered justice in cooperation with his noble judges (Lat. *iudex nobilium*) of Pest county at one of his courts of justice. Since justice was administered in a case that did not concern the county, it can be presumed that these noble judges were the permanent members of his court of justice. Fülöp Druget, the successor of Palatine Dózsa Debreceni, was appointed as a palatine (1323–1327), when he was the bailiff of Szepes and Újvár, and, in such capacity, he also took control of Torna, Gömör, Borsod and Heves counties. His palatine country house maintained in Vizsoly was principally engaged in the affairs of the nobles of the aforesaid counties. The sheer bulk of the diplomas issued on his behalf was released in Vizsoly despite that Miklós Perényi performed the duties of a palatine deputy judge there. The palatine was deputized in Buda by his deputy judge, Tamás, who managed the affairs of the nobles of the Transdanubian counties submitted to the palatine's court of justice. The demise of Palatine Fülöp Druget implied crucial changes in the judicial institution of the palatinate. The heritage of the deceased palatine was conferred by the king's favor upon Vilmos, the son of his brother, János. The crowned head also solidified Vilmos in the county offices of the departed Palatine Fülöp. Therefore, Vilmos acquired control over the country house in Vizsoly in line with Miklós Perényi's capacity as a deputy judge, while János, having been appointed as a palatine (1328–1333), was endowed by the king with the royal castle of Óbuda as an honorary demesne prior to his appointment as a palatine, where he transferred his palatine court of justice. János visited the countryside only for the purpose of convoking palatine conventions, but, in contrast with his predecessor, he already proceeded so in Transdanubia. This was partly related to the fact that, in addition to his palatinate, he directed many contiguous Transdanubian counties (Somogy, Fejér, Tolna) that have been located along the Danube River. Moreover, Bács, Zemplén and Ung counties were also under his control. The two Drugets, father and son, held tremendous power in their hands in the central and northwestern regions of the country during János' mandate as a palatine. The take over of the royal palace of Óbuda heralded two points: pro primo, the king ultimately ceased to use it as a royal residence; and pro secundo, a process commenced, by which the palatine's jurisdiction was assimilated into the king's court at the end of the supremacy of King Charles I. The independent diploma circulating activity of the vice-palatine seated in Buda was nearly totally terminated during János Druget's palatinate, and the deputy judge of the palatine of Óbuda seldom delivered judicial verdicts on his own behalf. Noteworthy time gaps can be recognized in the publishing of Palatine János Druget's publications, who released his diplomas mainly in Óbuda; such phenomenon can partly be explained by the time period of his service rendered to the head of the state, and partly by that the number of legal proceedings having taken place at his palatine court of justice was not as high as that pinpointed in case of his successor. In 1333, Palatine János Druget escorted his master to Naples, the lord's homeland, from where the palatine could not return owing to his demise. After his return from his journey to Naples, King Charles I appointed Vilmos Druget (1334–1342), who operated as a vice-palatine in his absence, as a successor of János. Palatine Vilmos printed his own publications on his own behalf both in Óbuda and, for a long time, in Vizsoly, which required him

to initiate the application of more seals in order to manage his affairs simultaneously by his vice-palatines. His judicial documents were sealed with his medium seals and were produced as such. In order to distinguish the palatine's personal jurisdiction from that of his vice-palatines, the institution of the (court of) special palatine presence was launched in 1336. The first record of it refers to Vizsoly, and the following ones increasingly refer to Visegrád. The court of special palatine presence was relocated to Maros, adjacent to Visegrád in the fall of 1340, and ulteriorly its operation, in unison with that of Vizsoly, was wound up in the beginning of 1342. Although performing severally, the palatine's court was eventually assimilated into the courts of justice of the king's court.

### **5. Felhévíz as a *pro tempore* judicial center adjacent to Buda**

Roughly concurrently with the king's relocation from Temesvár (Timișoara) to Visegrád, the court of justice of Judge Royal Hermán of the Lampert clan, the chief judge of the king's court was of course transferred to the central region of the country in March 1323, but not to Visegrád, rather to Budafelhévíz. András Kubinyi's concept in respect to this milestone propounded that Visegrád was not sufficiently equipped to host the government authorities, hence the preference of the aforesaid settlement adjacent to Buda. Iván Bertényi added to this concept that, in the final phase of the battle against the oligarchs, the sovereign and his councilors in the focus fairly discerned not to direct the country only from one position. Nevertheless, this preference is dumbfounding, because Buda or even Óbuda would have suited the traditions and the matter of location much preferable. Perhaps, their aim was to emphasize the elaboration plan of those hubs that were independent from them, but still approximately situated, or perhaps, Judge Royal Lampert personally chose Budafelhévíz owing to lack of the sufficient capacity of Visegrád to host the authorities. The "clients" in this manner were compelled to get accustomed to the given circumstances, to say they temporarily could not fare to the Judge Royal's office in the royal residence, or in Buda. The concrete place, where the Judge Royal's country house of Felhévíz operated, must have been the king's old court, which has been referred to as King Béla's court according to the sources. Order was already reimposed in the times of the successors of Judge Royal Hermán of the Lampert clan: Judge Royal Sándor Köcski (1324–1328) and Judge Royal Pál Nagymartoni (1328–1349) transferred their offices to Visegrád, the royal residence.

### **6. Royal measures concerning Óbuda and Buda**

Although the royal castle was conserved, the Hungarian potentates did not regard Óbuda as an optional royal residence from the beginning of the 14<sup>th</sup> century onwards. The most conspicuous sign of it was that all of the sovereigns allowed their most influential barons to take advantage of the castle transiently in order to gain their favor. In 1305, the castellan of the castle was Master István Bogár [Máréi], who, according to specific records dating to 1310, was János Kőszegi's familiar; consequently the royal palace of Óbuda was in the hand of János Kőszegi during the ascendancy of Wenceslaus III Premyslid, and presumably of Otto III of Bavaria. Prior to his coronation, King Charles I appointed his adherent, Master Mikcs of the Ákos clan, castellan and the bailiff of Óbuda, as the head of the castle, and soon after that he allowed Máté Csák, *de facto camerarius* that was considered as the second royal dignity in those days, to utilize the facility for a limited period of time. Máté, subsequent to the lawful coronation of King Charles I, antagonized the monarch and launched his military operations from there against Buda that hosted the royal residence. As a consequence, the ruler deprived him of his camerarius title and recaptured the castle of Buda from him. After that King Charles I assigned his own castellan, Master Pál who was the son of Dénes Jánki, the younger brother of Tamás, the bailiff of Bereg, and the relative of László Jánki, the archbishop of Kalocsa, but we have data referring to his function as a castellan only dating to the period between 1321 and 1324. As has been mentioned earlier, the king allowed János Druget, who he directly appointed as his palatine followingly, to utilize the castle. From that point of time, the castle remained under the control of the Drugets until the demise of Palatine Vilmos

Druget in August 1342, and, as we might have seen already, Óbuda was altered into a judicial center by the delegation of the (court of) special palatine presence there. Subsequent to the decease of Palatine Vilmos, King Louis I the Great endowed the castle with all of its accessories and income with his mother, Elisabeth of Poland, so that she could furnish her own widow queenly court. This event closed the history of the royal castle, and a new epoch, the history of the queenly castle of Óbuda commenced that persisted until 1526.

Of the measures concerning the town of Buda, it was of utmost importance for the king to appoint an impeccably reliable person as the principal of the town. Subsequent to the demise of Werner's son, László, the monarch appointed János Hencfi, who, as the castellan of the castle of Illyéd in Krassó County, combated in his army, supported him in acceding to the throne, certainly possessed the title of the rector of the castle of Buda in January 1318, and prior or subsequent to this episode had been or was appointed as the bailiff of Moson and the castellan of Óvár that was the integral part of the former title. János Hencfi represented the crowned head's honorable principal of the town, whose assistance King Charles I requested as regards national matters. He participated in the ratification of peace treaties and he had access to the royal court, where he, as an associate judge, frequently attended the Judge Royal's court of justice, and it is conceivable that he was sometimes invited to the sessions of the royal council. Rector János excellently represented his town at the king's court according to his prestige and rank. He made efforts to convince the sovereign to corroborate the charter of privileges presented by the residents of Buda to King Béla IV in 1244, as well as the town's national right of holding fairs and sometime its pre-emption right in 1331, which the law book and legal code of Buda stipulated in a discrete article, so that King Charles I imparted a double-sealed diploma concerning the aforementioned to the town. The crowned head's economical reforms were extraordinarily beneficial to the development of Buda. The town procured its leading position in minting during his dominion. The coins produced in the town served as a specimen to the other minting chambers, and the chambers incorporated by him were directed by the residents of Buda as chamber bailiffs, who were in charge of not only those in Buda, but of other chambers as well. Uniquely, during the supremacy of King Charles I and his son, King Louis I the Great, the town had its own currency minted. Sources, nonetheless, do not chronicle whether the sovereign granted the right of minting to the town, by which he would have jeopardized his royal prerogative; to be noted that the impressing number of the coin artifacts discovered in the town of Buda confirm the existence of the aforesaid right of minting. Identically, the commercial treaty concluded at the royal convention held in Visegrád was very beneficial for the town and its residents, as a consequence of which the determination of a new commercial route *ad interim* embargoed the pre-emption right of Vienna and helped the activities of the Czech, Moravian, and Polish merchants trespassing the Hungarian Kingdom. Nothing proves the prestige of Buda in the age of King Charles I better than the fact that the endowment of the Fehérvár right was increasingly replaced by the endowment of the right of the town of Buda or of the liberty of its right of holding fairs.

János Hencfi must have passed away sometime in the days of the royal convention, and his son, Miklós inherited his rectoral office, yet he was endowed neither with his father's bailiff nor with his castellan title, and he did not play as substantial role in state administration and government as his father did; he found his particular way of career within the frame of urban administration and management. He also fulfilled his office until his decease sometime around 1346/1347. Subsequently, Louis I the Great terminated the institution of rectorship and rehabilitated the town's free right to elect a judge. It is conceivable that his decree was related to the commencement of the construction of the first Anjou palace at the southern edge of the Castle Hill within the town walls, yet farther from the town.

## **Recapitulation**

The vibrant history of Buda as a royal residence that abounds in occurrences and twists can fundamentally be divided into three periods. From the starting point to the middle of the 13<sup>th</sup>

century, (Ó)buda became the determining town among the royal seats until the establishment of Buda on the Castle Hill, and consequently it had to share its task with the newly established town. By the construction of royally owned facilities and via his actions determining the life of the town, King Béla IV, the founder of new Buda expressed his will to alter the new town into a place that would have been suitable to host the royal quarters. As regards this second period, according to the sources of avail, it is still unascertainable whether the old town having been existing in the Late Árpadian Age and called as Óbuda from that point of time, or the new town of Buda hosted the itinerant king, who still migrated and was most of the time mobile, but frequently visited his central residence annually. It is most likely that for the ordinary subjects of mediaeval times, at least in the second half of the 13<sup>th</sup> century, these two areas were not as visibly distinguished from each other as has been hypothesized nowadays. Therefore, asking whether Óbuda or Buda was the royal residence might not be construed adequately in concern to this era. It became discernible at the outset of the 14<sup>th</sup> century and at the beginning of the third period started by struggles for the throne subsequent to the extinction of the Árpáds that the town of Buda founded on the Castle Hill was indeed the centre of the Hungarian Kingdom and the royal residence. The town, nonetheless, had only little time to enjoy such a privilege, because King Charles I was forced to surrender his residential seat in Buda in 1314 due to the fierce combat with the oligarchs. From that point of time, the town was coerced into ceasing to exist as a royal seat for nearly one hundred years, yet the relatively frequent royal presence in Buda and the central jurisdictional *raison d'être* of the vicinity of Buda and of Óbuda sustained the opportunity for Buda to metamorphose into a permanent royal residence again with some time passing. To this purpose, though, the palace construction in Buda on the southern part of the Castle Hill launched in or subsequent to that period by King Louis I the Great, who provisionally moved to Buda between 1347 and 1355, was indispensable, which project was finished nearly half a century later. It is the responsibility of the future researchers to discover this epoch explicitly and to complete the royal itinerarium accurately.

## References connected to the theme of this dissertation

- A budavári királyi székhely és palota története a középkortól a törökkor végéig. [The history of the royal residence and palace in the Castle of Buda from mediaeval times to the end of the period of the Turkish occupation of Hungary.] In: Budavári palota évszázadai. [Centuries of the palace in the Castle of Buda.] Budapest 2000. 3–18.
  
- Les relations franco-hongroises et le château de Buda, siege royal, du Moyen Âge à la fin de l'époque turque. In: Un château pour un royaume Budapest. Paris, 2001. pp. 13–24.
  
- Adalékok a budavári István torony névadójának kérdéséhez. [Data to the question of the eponym of the István Tower in the Castle of Buda.] Budapest Régiségei [The Antiquities of Budapest] 35. (2002) 403–425.
  
- A budavári Boldogasszony egyház alapításának története. [The history of the foundation of the Blessed Virgin Church in the Castle of Buda.] Budapest Régiségei [The Antiquities of Budapest] 37 (2003) 91–112.
  
- A „Prédikátorok Rendjének” európai kolostoralapításai és a domonkos rendi kolostortemplomok patrocíniumai a 13. században. [The European monastery foundations of the Order of Preachers and the patrociniiums of the Dominicans' monastery temples in the 13<sup>th</sup> century.] In: Változatok a történelemre. [Variations of history.] Tanulmányok Székely György tiszteletére. [Essays in tribute to György Székely.] Edited by ERDEI, Gyöngyi – NAGY, Balázs. Budapest 2004. 157–170.
  
- A magyarországi beginák és beginakolostorok a 13. században. [Hungarian Beghards and Beguins in the 13<sup>th</sup> century.] In: Studia professoris–Professor studiorum. Tanulmányok Érszegi Géza hatvanadik születésnapjára. [Essays to Géza Érszegi's 60<sup>th</sup> birthday.] Edited by ALMÁSI, Tibor, DRASKÓCZY, István, JANCSÓ, Éva. Budapest 2005. 297–313.