

THE PAPAL TAXES COLLECTED IN TRANSYLVANIA DURING THE TIME OF THE AVIGNON POPES (1307-1377)

Abstract: Pontifical taxes represented one of the most important aspects of the Avignon period of the papacy. The French popes developed a taxation mechanism that was used throughout the Catholic world. During the time of the Avignon popes, the Catholic clergy in Transylvania was incorporated into the vast papal taxation mechanism. Thus, in the fourteenth century, Transylvania was visited by a series of papal collectors, who exacted various taxes on behalf of the French Popes. The most important action in this regard was the collection of tithes from 1332 to 1337. Papal taxation could not operate in this border area of Christianity without the support of the Angevin kings of Hungary, who were rewarded by the papacy with a part of the amounts collected. However, the collection of papal taxes had a negative impact on both the clergy and the laity. The most important papal taxes collected in Transylvania were: the *annates*, the income for the first year of holding a church benefice, *servitia communia*, paid by all the bishops and abbots, and tithes, which represented a tenth of the ecclesiastical income.

Keywords: Avignon papacy, papal taxation, Transylvania, tithe.

The Avignon papacy and the church tax system. Between 1307 and 1377, the papacy was forced to relocate its see from Rome to Avignon, in southern France. This was due to political circumstances that we examined in a previous study.¹ What is relevant for the present study is that during the Avignon period, the papacy developed a mechanism of centralised government, inspired from the example set by the secular states. The result of this process was the transformation of the ecclesiastical institution into a centralised monarchy, the Roman Church adapting thus to the spirit of the time.² In order to support this endeavour, the French popes developed a vast institutional apparatus that we also analysed in a previous study.³ We will not go back on it, but we consider it necessary to mention that the Apostolic Camera played an important role, since it was the institution that managed the papal finances and fiscality. The origins of this institution lie in the eleventh century, when it was led by a *camerarius*, who was usually a cardinal.⁴

An important aspect of centralised papal government in the Avignon period⁵ was the Holy Father's exclusive right to reserve ecclesiastical benefices (bishop, abbot,

¹ Răzvan Mihai Neagu, "Cum a devenit Avignon-ul reședința papilor," in *Istorie și Civilizație*, no. 23, 2011, p. 56-60.

² Alexandru Florin Platon, Laurențiu Rădvan, Bogdan Petru Maleon, *O istorie a Europei de Apus în Evul Mediu. De la Imperiul Roman târziu la marile descoperiri geografice (secolele V-XVI)*, Iași. Ed. Polirom, 2010, p. 432.

³ Răzvan Mihai Neagu, "Considerații privind mecanismele de guvernare ale papilor de la Avignon," in *Comunicări științifice*, IX, Mediaș, 2010, pp. 29-34.

⁴ Șerban Turcuș, *Vademecum la Sfântul Scaun*. Bucharest. Ed. Academiei Române, 2007, p. 183.

⁵ The popes of the Avignon period were: Clement V (1305-1314), John XXII (1316-1334), Benedict XII (1334-1342), Clement VI (1342-1352), Innocent VI (1352-1362), Urban V (1362-1370) and Gregory XI (1370-1378). Let us emphasise that they were all of French extraction (author's note).

canon, etc.), which was the most effective means of governing the Church during this period. This process started on 27 August 1265, when under the decretal *Licet Ecclesiam*, Clement IV stipulated that in the future, the popes would have full right of decision over the ecclesiastical dignities and benefices, which they could distribute if they were vacant, and that they would also be entitled to grant a right to a benefice before it was vacant, through the system of expectative grace.⁶ The Avignon popes extended this provision, so much so that at the end of Gregory XI's pontificate (1378), almost all the church benefices were at the papal discretion.⁷

In the first year of his pontificate, John XXII distributed 3,000 benefices and expectative graces.⁸ These appointments served to augment the papal authority over the local churches and weaken the influence of the sovereigns, the feudal lords and the cathedral chapters. The measures adopted by the sovereign pontiffs sparked diverse reactions of opposition in England, Bohemia or the German space. The German cathedral chapters did not want to lose the right of election, which is why a significant part of the clergy supported Emperor Louis of Bavaria in his confrontation against John XXII. Those who took advantage of the system of appointment to benefices were the clerics from the entourage of the papal Curia, those who were close to the cardinals, and in the border areas of *Christianitas*, such as Hungary, even the lay princes. An eloquent example was the appointment of the Bishop of Transylvania, Andrei, by Pope John XXII in 1320.⁹ The appointments to benefices increased considerably the pope's influence over the clergy, but this influence was not received positively in all the areas. Thus, in Würzburg, a French cleric sent 3 of his compatriots to publish the bull which appointed him as archdeacon, but the chapter canons had his envoys thrown into the River Main.¹⁰

During the Avignon era, all the minor and major benefices were subject to rigorous and oppressive taxation, which could also be interpreted as an effort made by the church to adapt to a rising monetary economy. In the Avignon period, the papacy introduced a new tax, the *annatus*, which stipulated the payment by the holder of any ecclesiastical function of his first year's profits from that office.¹¹ The tax was first

⁶ Michel Mollat du Jourdin, André Vauchez, *Storia del Cristianesimo*, vol. VI *Un tempo di prove (1274-1449)*. Citta Nova, 1998, p.66.

⁷ Philip Hughes, *A History of the Church*, vol. III. London. Sheed & Ward, 1960, p.163.

⁸ For John XXII's beneficial policy, see John Weakland, "Administrative and Fiscal Centralization under Pope John XXII, 1316-1334, Part I," in *The Catholic Historical Review*, Vol. 54, No. 1, 1968, passim and John Weakland, "Administrative and Fiscal Centralization under Pope John XXII, 1316-1334, Part II," in *The Catholic Historical Review*, Vol. 54, No. 2, 1968, passim.

⁹ Addressing himself to Bishop Andrei of Transylvania on 1 July 1320, Pope John XXII said that although the bishop's learning was not abundant and he was at a disadvantage in terms of his position in the church hierarchy and his age, "since you are assigned to the smallest rungs and you are known to be in the twenty-seventh year of your life or around it, under the age required," he had accepted his appointment because "our beloved son in Christ, Charles, the illustrious King of Hungary, through his envoys and his special letters, like other magnates, from those parts, has praised you to us for the worthiness of your great honour," *Documente privind istoria României seria C Transilvania, veacul XIV, vol. I (1301-1320)*. Bucharest, Ed. Academiei Române, 1953, p.361 (hereinafter DIR C, XIV, I).

¹⁰ Jean Favier, *Les Papes d'Avignon*. Paris, Fayard, 2006, p.232.

¹¹ Bernard Guillemain, *Les papes d'Avignon 1309-1376*. Paris, Les Éditions du Cerf, 2000, p. 55.

introduced by Clement V in 1306 only for England and only for the benefices that remained vacant through the death of the holder located in the Curia. In 1326, John XXII generalised this tax for the entire church and for all the benefices.¹² An austere spirit, Pope Benedict XII (1334-1342) suppressed the tax, but it was reintroduced by his successor, Clement VI (1342-1352). In 1376, Gregory XI extended the tax over the benefices granted through the system of expectative graces, where the holder of that office was not yet installed.¹³ The *annatus* was an extremely heavy duty and threatened the livelihood of the cleric. It was paid in instalments, sometimes for a long period behind, since a cleric could also be bound to pay this tax for his predecessor. The holders of the major benefices (the bishops and the abbots) were subjected to taxation with the *servitia communia*. Initially, this was a gift, a gesture of gratitude that a bishop or an abbot made towards the Roman pontiff and his subordinate staff, which became generalised from the thirteenth century on and turned into a permanent tax.¹⁴ This could be paid in instalments, in person or by proxy, within a period of maximum two years. Starting from the period of Clement VI's pontificate, the payment of this tax was delayed for a rather long time interval. Thus, the prosecutor Thomas Le Pourri granted deferrals, for up to 20 years, as for instance in the case of the Abbot of Saint Germer de Fly, who in 1372 undertook to pay 500 florins, but which he fully paid only in 1390.¹⁵ It very often happened for a bishop or an abbot to pay also a part of the *servitia communia* which had not been acquitted by its predecessor. One such case occurred in 1367, when Bishop Dominic of Cenad paid the Holy See - through Jacob, the lector of the church in Cenad - 88 florins, 55 solidi and 6 deniers, representing the *servitia communia* of his predecessor, Bishop Grigore.¹⁶ The amount of this tax varied from one diocese to another.

Another important duty was the tithe (*taxatio ad decimam*), which began as a voluntary tax paid by the holder of a benefice in response to a distress call launched by the papacy.¹⁷ In the Avignon period, this tax became compulsory and those who eschewed paying it were excommunicated. A vast action of collecting tithes was deployed in the Transylvanian space between 1332 and 1337. The Avignon papacy did not limit itself to these taxes. If a prelate was invested as archbishop, he had to pay the *pallium* tax, as well as the *ad limina* tax if he undertook the *ad limina apostolorum* visits (to the door of the Apostles). Other papal revenues were derived from the commutation of various sentences and from the papal vassals: the Neapolitan, Aragonese and English Kingdoms.

Another source of papal income was the Roman pontiff's right to the property of deceased clerics (*ius spoli*), the right to manage the goods of the bishops and the abbots who had passed away. In the case of Hungary, the first collection of papal taxes was

¹² Hughes, *op. cit.*, p.165.

¹³ Guillemain, *op. cit.*, p. 56.

¹⁴ *Ibidem*, p. 55.

¹⁵ Favier, *op. cit.*, p.240.

¹⁶ *Documenta Romaniae Historica, seria C, Transilvania, vol. XIII (1366-1370)*. Bucharest, Ed. Academiei Române, 1994, p. 355 (hereinafter DRH C, XIII).

¹⁷ Such a tithe was levied in 1221 for the crusade against the Albigenses, another in 1274, at the Second Council of Lyon, as well as at the Council of Vienne (1311-1312), the last two for crusades that were never undertaken (author's note).

conducted between 1281 and 1286, the one entrusted with this mission being Gerardo da Modena.¹⁸

Papal fiscality and Cardinal Gentile's legation. The papacy's fiscal mechanism also included Hungary and, implicitly, Transylvania, through the Dioceses of Alba Iulia, Oradea and Cenad, which were the suffragans of the Archdiocesan See of Caloccea.

A definitive and absolute total amount of the papal revenues collected in Transylvania throughout the fourteenth century would be impossible to ascertain, given the lack complete documentation. Still, a partial reconstitution of these amounts can be made based on the notes of the various papal collectors who also functioned in the Transylvanian area. This reconstitution may clearly reveal the types of taxes exacted by the Holy See. The first amounts collected by the papacy in Transylvania in the fourteenth century came from the maintenance fees of the pontifical legate Gentile, a Cardinal-Priest of the Church of San Martino ai Monti in Rome. These taxes had an exceptional character, being generated by the presence of the cardinal as a papal legate. He was appointed as a legate to Hungary by Pope Clement V in 1307, in the context of the Arpadians' dynastic struggle for succession.¹⁹ Gentile had the mission to impose the candidate approved by the Holy See, Charles Robert of Anjou, as king. The cardinal was a *de latere* legate, which meant that he was not only sent by the pope, but that he also stood by his side, that he was an extension of the pope's spiritual and physical body.²⁰ The *de latere* legate's field of action was rather broad, and he enjoyed the highest authority. He had the right to assign the minor benefices, he was entitled to enforce ecclesiastical sanctions, excommunication and interdict, and his authority also extended over the religious orders, as he had the mission to persecute the heretics and the competence to negotiate in international conflicts.²¹ The arrival of this papal envoy in Hungary also entailed a special tax that the prelates had to pay. On 8 August 1307, Pope Clement V authorised Gentile to compel the Hungarian prelates to contribute to his maintenance. The cardinal could force the archbishops, bishops, abbots, priors, deans, provosts, archdeacons and parish priests to pay the due maintenance taxes under the threat of ecclesiastical penalties. The papal provision also extended to the monks, the chapters and the convents. The tax was also to be paid by all the orders of monks and warrior-monks.²² In a document bearing the same date, the pope requested all the prelates in Hungary to assist Cardinal Gentile: "we demand your community and insistently advise it, proposing to you, through this apostolic letter, that out of the honour due to the apostolic see and to us, receiving with kindness and honour the said

¹⁸ Pál Engel, *Regatul Sfântului Ștefan. Istoria Ungariei Medievale 895-1526*. Cluj-Napoca, Ed. Mega, 2006, p. 170; *Monumenta Vaticana Historiam Regni Hungariae Illustrantia*. Series Prima. Tomus Primus. *Rationes Collectorum Pontificorum in Hungaria*. Pápai Tized-Szedők Számadásai. 1281-1375, Budapest, 2000, pp. 1-12 (hereinafter *Monumenta Vaticana Hungariae*, I).

¹⁹ Tudor Sălăgean, *Transilvania în a doua jumătate a secolului al XIII-lea. Afirmarea regimului congregațional*. Cluj-Napoca, Centrul de Studii Transilvane, 2007, p. 306; Zombori István, *Magyarország és a Szentsek Kapcsolatának ezer éve*, Budapest, 1996, p. 59.

²⁰ Șerban Turcuș, *Sinodul general de la Buda (1279)*, Cluj-Napoca, Presa Universitară Clujeană, 2001, p. 33.

²¹ *Ibidem*, p. 34.

²² DIR C XIV, I, p. 53.

legate or, rather, us through him, you should go to great lengths when he or his envoy prompts you to do so.”²³

An overall picture of the amounts collected by Gentile in Hungary and, especially, in the Transylvanian area can be found in the cardinal's account book, which includes notes on the years 1308-1311. For the year 1308, the elected Bishop of Transylvania, Benedict, paid 306 marks and one vierdung, which represented a part of the maintenance fee for the first year of the legation.²⁴ In connection with the Diocese of Transylvania, another entry from 1311 has been preserved: on 25 August, another sum was paid, the exact amount of which is unknown, on behalf of the bishop, representing another part of the total amount due. Another instalment was paid at Wienerneustadt on 12 September 1311, through the Canon of Alba, Ioan Nobilul. He paid 228 marks of sterling Venice silver, after the weight in Buda, into the account of the bishop's 646-mark debt to the cardinal. Gentile stated that 418 marks still had to be paid by the Easter holiday of the year 1312. The maintenance fees for the papal legate represented one of the reasons for delaying the process of electing the new Bishop of Transylvania, the Dominican Benedict. This process spanned the period from 1308 to 1310. Throughout the year 1309, in the election process, the cardinal's auditors invoked several times the fact that the maintenance fee for the pontifical legate had not been paid on time.²⁵ Because of this, the bishop could not obtain his confirmation from the cardinal. On 14 November 1309, the Transylvanian chapter paid 12 silver marks after the weight in Buda, representing the maintenance fee owed to the cardinal.²⁶

The maintenance fees were also a reason for the pressure that was exerted on Bishop Benedict. On 2 May 1310, Gentile instructed Benedict about the fees “[due] to us for the first and the second years, whatever you have gathered so far or may still gather, you shall order it brought into our treasury.”²⁷ If the above-mentioned fees were not paid, in addition to the spiritual penalties, their due amounts would be tripled. The cardinal advised the bishop “to satiate us at once” and not wait until he was convicted.²⁸ Raising the amount necessary to pay the taxes for the cardinal was not easy, especially in a period of distress to the diocese, which was at the discretion of Voivode Ladislaus Kán for a substantial period of time. Only on 15 December 1310, in Bratislava, did Gentile confirm that he had received 15 marks from the Bishop of Transylvania, paid through the merchant Francesco Lapi Rocchetti.²⁹

The sums exacted by Cardinal Gentile burdened the Church of Transylvania, and Bishop Benedict officially protested to the Holy See against these taxes. In a letter he sent from Alba Iulia to Pope Clement V, on 24 June 1311, Benedict showed his concern about the proximity of the payment date for the fourth year of Gentile's legation, being afraid that he, his church and the entire diocesan clergy would have to pay 500 or 450 silver marks. The bishop stated that “neither my means, nor those of my church or [even] those

²³ *Ibidem*, p. 54.

²⁴ *Ibidem*, pp. 61-62.

²⁵ *Ibidem*, pp. 79-81.

²⁶ *Ibidem*, p. 86.

²⁷ *Ibidem*, p. 174.

²⁸ *Ibidem*.

²⁹ *Ibidem*, p. 182.

of the entire clergy will suffice, for given the payment of the maintenance expenses of the previous legations, unjustly placed upon us in the face of God and of justice, we have plunged, together with the clergy, into such great poverty and lack that the means of the churches no longer cover even our sustenance.”³⁰ Benedict accused Gentile before the pontiff that he had not taken into account the fact that the Church of Transylvania had been robbed of its property during the vacancy of the episcopal see. Hoping for aid from the pope, the bishop entrusted to the Holy See “my being, my church, my movable and immovable property, my town and my entire clergy, as well as their property and their churches.”³¹ The Bishop of Transylvania described the taxes levied by the cardinal as “unjust spoliations.” The lamentation of the Bishop of Alba before the Apostolic See failed to achieve its purpose because on 12 September 1311, Cardinal Gentile certified the receipt of part of the amount owed to him by the Transylvanian bishop. This part amounted to 520½ silver marks, out of the total debt of 938½ silver marks for the first, second and third years of the legation. Because of this gesture, the cardinal relinquished the ecclesiastical penalties of excommunication and interdict, which would have been applied to the chapter if that amount had not been paid. As for the rest of the 418 marks, a postponement was granted until the Easter of 1312, provided that the full maintenance fees were paid through Hambott, a citizen of Bratislava, or the Peruzzi Bank in Venice, at the expense of the Bishop of Transylvania.³² This document reveals the vast mechanism for the collection of papal taxes, which included agents in the territory (Hambott from Bratislava), as well as good cooperation with the Italian banks of the time (the Peruzzi Bank in Venice). Moreover, like any bank, the papacy claimed interest if the payment of the amounts was delayed. Thus, on 20 April 1312, the convent in Bratislava issued a letter of protest to Ioan, Archdeacon of Cluj and Protonotary of the Bishop of Transylvania, denouncing the fact that the episcopal envoy had refused to pay Hambott, Cardinal Gentile’s attorney, an interest of 10% for the sum of 370 marks and 100 vierdungs.³³ Gentile’s activity in Transylvania also included supporting the interests of Charles Robert of Anjou, who was strongly contested by Voivode Ladislaus Kán, the holder of the Holy Crown. Thus, on 25 December 1309, to pressure Kán, he pronounced the excommunication of the Transylvanian voivode.³⁴

The papacy did not want to strike off the outstanding amounts of Cardinal Gentile’s maintenance fee. At the end of 1316, the Holy See assigned the task of recovering this debt to Rufinus of Civino, Archdeacon of Tolna, in the Diocese of Pécs. His mission was not limited only to Transylvania, since he also had the task to recover the debts owed to the cardinal by Archbishop Toma of Esztergom, Bishop Ladislau of Pécs and Bishop Ștefan of Veszprém. It is known that Rufinus left Avignon and entered Hungary on 22 October 1317, through Zambor, in Zagreb County, and that he left the Angevin kingdom on 12 March 1320. From his account book, we learn that Bishop Benedict of Transylvania owed 953 marks for the maintenance of the cardinal.³⁵ Four

³⁰ *Ibidem*, p. 193.

³¹ *Ibidem*.

³² *Ibidem*, p. 195.

³³ *Ibidem*, p. 200.

³⁴ Sălăgean, *op. cit.*, p. 274.

³⁵ DIR, C XIV, I, p. 256.

payments were made on behalf of Bishop Benedict, as follows: the first payment: on 20 September 1318, Ioan Nobilul, Archdeacon of Alba paid 44½ marks plus 7 bullions and a half of sterling silver, after the weight in Buda;³⁶ the second payment: on 25 October 1318, 2 marks and 4½ silver bullions were paid, the first and the second payments totalling 46 marks and 3 vierdungs, which was the equivalent to 187 florins;³⁷ the third payment: on 1 January 1320, the Dominican Mihail of Buda paid, on behalf of the Bishop of Transylvania, 43 marks, 37 marks of which represented the tithe retained by Hambott from Bratislava, Cardinal Gentile's attorney, for the expenses that he would incur for sending 370 marks to Venice. The papal collector stated that out of the 953 marks paid by the Bishop of Transylvania, he had given 6 marks to Hambott for the expenses entailed by sending 47 marks and one vierdung to Venice. Rufinus complained in that document that "this silver was not sterling silver."³⁸ The fourth payment was carried out by Archdeacon Petru of Solnoc and Canon of the Church of Transylvania, who showed Rufinus of Civino a letter written by Cardinal Gentile which confirmed that the Bishop of Alba had paid him 520½ marks for the first, second and third years of his ministry as an apostolic legate. Another document was also submitted, ascertaining that Bishop Benedict had paid Hambott, the cardinal's attorney, 370 marks, and there is a further document written by Gentile which states that the Bishop of Transylvania paid another 15 silver marks.³⁹

In the conclusion to his accounts referring to Cardinal Gentile's legation, Rufinus the collector said that the money levied from the Archdiocese of Esztergom, the Dioceses of Transylvania, Veszprém and Pécs and from the money cashed by Hambott in Bratislava amounted to a total of 269½ marks, 43 marks of which were not sterling silver, and that the 131½ marks received from the Bishop of Veszprém had been both sterling and common silver.⁴⁰

The questions that naturally arise are what these amounts represented to the papacy and why the pontiffs carefully oversaw their collection. The answer to these questions is found in the centralising policies and the fiscal imperatives promoted by the popes of Avignon. Cardinal Gentile's legation was extremely important and meaningful for the Hungarian Kingdom. Gentile was sent as *legatus de latere*, in other words, as an *alter ego* of the pope. He confirmed the papal favourite, Charles Robert of Anjou, as King of Hungary. Gentile came to Hungary in a troubled period, which marked the transition from the Arpadian to the Angevin dynasty. In such a fretful period, the higher Hungarian clergy showed signs of insubordination: it was the case of Bishop Antoniu of Cenad, who crowned Otto of Bavaria as King in 1305, even though only the Archbishop of Esztergom had that right.⁴¹ This constituted a serious breach of the rules established by the pope regarding the coronation of the King of Hungary. On the other hand, the situation in the Diocese of Transylvania was more than delicate, because after the death

³⁶ *Ibidem*, p. 257.

³⁷ *Ibidem*.

³⁸ *Ibidem*, p. 258.

³⁹ *Ibidem*.

⁴⁰ *Ibidem*, p. 259.

⁴¹ *Cronica pictată de la Viena în Izvoarele Istoriei Românilor*, vol. XI, Text, translation and comments by G. Popa-Lisseanu, Bucharest, 1937, p. 226.

of Bishop Petrus in 1307, Voivode Ladislaus Kán occupied the cathedral and forced the canons to elect his son as bishop. The voivode continued to insult the diocese, invading all its estates and properties. Because of these deeds, the Diocese of Transylvania was in a state of general chaos. One of Cardinal Gentile's purposes was to put an end to this situation and to restore order and discipline in the Hungarian Church. The cardinal launched a long process for validating the election of the new Bishop of Transylvania, a Dominican monk, Benedict, who had also been proposed by Ladislaus Kán. An important role in this process was played by the maintenance fees owed to Gentile by the clerics. Their payment signified the obedience and submission of the local clergy to the *de latere* legate and, implicitly, to the Holy See. If we take into account that John XXII - the one who created the tax collection mechanism in the Avignon period - became pope in 1316, we may realise why the recovery of these amounts was so important to the papacy. Their payment strengthened and consolidated the bonds between the Holy See and the local Churches of Hungary and Transylvania in particular, despite the fact that the amounts were not to the liking of the local hierarchy, as proved by the memorandum sent by Bishop Benedict of Transylvania to the pope in 1311.

The question of vacant benefices. The revenues of the vacant ecclesiastical offices were attracted to the papal treasury starting in 1265. The matter was definitively regulated by Pope John XXII through the apostolic constitutions *Ex debito* of 1316 and *Execrabilis* of 1317. This activity included the Dioceses of Transylvania, Oradea and Cenad, which demonstrates that the new fiscal policy adopted by the Holy See expanded to the eastern edge of the Christian world.

Among the tasks Rufinus of Civino was sent to carry out in Hungary, there was the collection of the ecclesiastical revenues from the vacant benefices, a mission in which he was to be assisted by the Archbishops of Esztergom and Calocsa (8 December 1316).⁴² Fortunately for the Dioceses of Transylvania, Oradea and Cenad, Rufinus's account books for the vacant benefices of these dioceses have been preserved. The document that presented the reckoning of the papal taxes stated that Rufinus's task, assisted, as he was, by the two archbishops, was to gather for the Apostolic Camera "half of the fruits from the vacant benefices, valued at over 6 silver marks a year, and the other [half] we shall leave to the beneficiaries, so that they may be able to cover the burden of the benefices from it."⁴³ This new fiscal burden imposed by the Holy See did not please the local clergy, which is why on 17 June 1318, John XXII gave Rufinus the right to constrain the Hungarian prelates to reveal the amount of the profits from the vacant ecclesiastical benefices. The pope confessed that the collection of the amounts "stumbled across a heavy obstacle because the said prelates and the other ecclesiastical faces from the said country will not reveal the size of those fruits, revenues and interests of the aforementioned benefices."⁴⁴ To address this drawback, Rufinus was granted the right to pass ecclesiastical sentences of interdict, anathema and suspension on any ecclesiastical dignitary who might obstruct the collection action.

⁴² DIR C, XIV, I, p. 255.

⁴³ *Ibidem*, p. 260.

⁴⁴ *Ibidem*, p. 299.

Pope John XXII was judicious about the revenues destined for the papal treasury. Thus, he asked the prelates of Hungary and Rufinus of Civino not to engage in unnecessary expenses with the collection of the revenues from the vacant benefices. The pontiff complained about the collectors and subcollectors in Hungary, who “waste many of these fruits, revenues and benefices through their senseless expenses.”⁴⁵ Wishing for a better use of the revenues collected, the pope sternly demanded that useless spending should cease, the two archbishops and Rufinus of Civino becoming responsible for this matter.

To get an idea about the income of the various prelates from the Dioceses of Transylvania, Oradea and Cenad, we consider it necessary to present Rufinus of Civino's accounts mirroring the situation he encountered here. The Archdeacon of Tolna appointed Coradus, the parish priest of Orăștie, as a subcollector in Transylvania, and he physically collected the money. We should specify that the amount owed to the Apostolic Camera represented half of the the income of the cleric who held that ecclesiastical position.

In the case of the Diocese of Transylvania, for the Archdeaconry of Tilegd, Coradus requested 20 silver marks, which was half of the revenue from the vacant benefice.⁴⁶ This amount was paid by Coradus to Rufinus on 6 September 1319. For the Archdeaconry of Ozd, the sum of 10 marks was paid.⁴⁷ For the various parishes in Transylvania, the sums that represented half of the revenues were 20 marks for the parishes of Sebeș and Călnic, 14 marks for the parish of Petrești (Alba County), 6 marks for the parish of Săsciori (Alba County), 7 marks for the parish of Răhău (Alba County), 10 marks for the parish of Bistrița and 6 marks for the parish of Dumitra (Bistrița-Năsăud County).⁴⁸ What may be noted is that all these vacant parishes were from the Saxon area, which explains the appointment of a Saxon subcollector, Coradus from Orăștie.

Rufinus's account books also recorded information about the canonries in the cathedral chapter of Alba Iulia. For a vacant canonry, subsequently occupied by Ruffus Petrus, half of his revenues totalled eight marks, but Coradus paid only 5 marks to Rufinus on 6 September 1319. The remaining 3 marks was paid to the papal envoy on 13 January 1320 by the Dominican Mihail of Buda from the Convent of St. Nicholas, who acted thus on behalf of the said canon. Another vacant canonry was received by Petrus Tartarus, who had to pay the collector also 8 marks, which were acquitted through the same Mihail of Buda at the same date.⁴⁹ Ioan of Mauriciu had to do the same for the archdeaconry that had been assigned to him. He paid the same amount through the same Dominican monk at the same date.

During Rufinus's mission, the Archdeaconry of Târnava was also vacant; 35 marks had to be paid for it, 30 marks being paid to the papal collector, leaving a debt of 6 marks.⁵⁰ The end of Rufinus of Civino's mission in Hungary coincided with Bishop Benedict's death (1319). The collector also mentioned other vacant benefices in the

⁴⁵ *Ibidem*.

⁴⁶ *Ibidem*, p. 264; *Monumenta Vaticana Hungariae*, I, p. 31.

⁴⁷ *Ibidem*, p. 265; *Monumenta Vaticana Hungariae*, I, p. 32.

⁴⁸ *Ibidem*, pp. 265-266; *Monumenta Vaticana Hungariae*, I, pp. 32-33.

⁴⁹ *Ibidem*, p. 267; *Monumenta Vaticana Hungariae*, I, pp. 34-35.

⁵⁰ *Ibidem*, p. 268.

Church of Transylvania, but said he had been unable to exact half of their revenue because of the bishop's death and had asked the chapter's members to deal with these amounts: the parish priest of Șibot had to pay 6 shillings, the one from Petrifalău 20 marks, the one from Vurpăr 15, the one from Aiud 10, the one from Brărabanț 6, the one from Sângeorgiu (the Beclean area) 10, the one from Apoldul de Sus 20.⁵¹

Those who did not want to declare the amount of the proceeds resulting from the church benefices or who made them impossible to find out risked losing them entirely, their entire revenues going to the pope. Rufinus's accounts show that the revenues of Albkarak parish could not be determined with certainty, being seized for the pope. A similar situation occurred in relation with Nicolae's canonry from the Church of Transylvania, who would not reveal the truth, but the bishop estimated the value of this canonry to 8 marks.⁵²

The analysis of these amounts shows that sometimes they were too high for those who paid them, which is why they were paid in instalments. What may be noticed is the dissatisfaction of the local clergy, who hesitated in being honest about the sums exacted by the papal collector. Worth mentioning is the fact that all the vacant canonries in the Church of Transylvania were assessed equally, to the same value of 8 marks, which demonstrates that the prebends that were attached to those canonries were also equal. For the archdeaconries mentioned in the accounts, the amounts owed to the papal treasury differed. This can be explained by the area in which each particular ecclesiastical unit was located, in terms of the development of the area and the number of parishes that pertained to it.

Rufinus of Civino collected a total of 137 marks, after the weight in Buda, from the Diocese of Transylvania, which was the equivalent of 548 florins. To these were added another 29 sterling silver marks, after the weight in Transylvania, and eleven groschen of Bohemia.⁵³

From across Hungary, Rufinus collected 2,960 florins, 1,744 of which were destined for his remuneration. Thus, the pope ended up with less than half of the sum levied, the remaining money being intended for the collector and probably for his apparatus of the actual cashing in of the money (the subcollectors and the other servants).

Insofar as the Diocese of Oradea was concerned, the great provostship of this cathedral church brought an income of 50 sterling silver marks, after the weight in Buda. On 2 February 1319, Provost Telegdi Csanád⁵⁴ paid Rufinus 25 marks, equivalent to 100 gold florins.⁵⁵ The lecturer's dignity was also vacant in the chapter in Oradea, and its income amounted to 18 silver marks. The 9 marks owed to the Apostolic Camera were paid to the papal collector by Ioan, the lecturer of the church in Oradea, on 2 February 1319.⁵⁶ For a canonry in the same church, later assigned to a certain Mauriciu, the Provost of Oradea paid Rufinus 8 marks on the same date, which was half

⁵¹ *Ibidem*; *Monumenta Vaticana Hungariae*, I, pp. 35-36.

⁵² *Ibidem*, p. 269.

⁵³ *Ibidem*.

⁵⁴ Telegdi Csanád was an intimate of King Charles Robert of Anjou, who supported him to become Archbishop of Esztergom and Primate of Hungary (1330-1349).

⁵⁵ DIR C, XIV, I, p. 262.

⁵⁶ *Ibidem*.

of the income of that canonry.⁵⁷ For the office of cantor, which was vacant in Oradea and was later given to Jacob, Provost Telegdi Csanád paid the papal collector four marks, representing half of the income of the cantorship.⁵⁸ From the Diocese of Oradea, Rufinus of Civino also collected the following amounts on 14 February 1319: 2.5 marks for an archdeaconry, 8 marks for a canonry, 8 marks for another canonry, 2.5 marks for the Archdeaconry of Bihor.⁵⁹ On 6 November 1319, the papal collector levied from the Diocese of Oradea 4 marks for a canonry and 3 marks for the cantorship of the Church in Oradea. The amount Rufinus gathered from the Diocese of Oradea was 81 silver marks, after the weight in Buda, which was the equivalent of 324 gold florins.⁶⁰

From the territory of the Diocese of Cenad, Rufinus of Civino levied the smallest amount of money. Thus, during his mission in the Diocese of Cenad, the Archdeaconry across the Mureș was vacant, and it had an income of 10 marks attached to it. On 7 November 1319, Bishop Benedict of Cenad paid the papal collector the 5 marks he owed, which represented the total amount of the money levied from the Diocese of Cenad.⁶¹

What may be noticed is that of the three dioceses, that of Transylvania paid the highest amount, followed by that of Oradea, while the money levied from the Diocese of Cenad corresponded to an insignificant amount. The documents of the various papal collectors who acted on the territory of Hungary also provide information about the vacant benefices in Transylvania and the amounts collected for the Apostolic Camera. Unfortunately, this information is incomplete, even though it highlights the continuity of the papal fiscal policy throughout the entire period of Avignon.

In the accounts of Peter of Gervasius, the papal envoy to Hungary in the years 1341-1342, there is also a mention referring to the vacancy of the provostship of the Church in Oradea. This remained vacant for two years and a half, and its revenues were collected by Bishop Andrei. He informed the papal collector that he had paid 1,000 florins to the Apostolic Camera, as evidenced by a letter from the papal treasurer, Jacob of Broa: "Item est sciendum, quod dominus Andreas episcopus Waradiensis convenerat mecum de fructibus prepositure ecclesie Waradiensis, que per morte domini Stephani quondam prepositi dicte ecclesie per duos annos cum dimidio apud sedem apostolicam vacaverat, de quibus idem episcopus confessus fuit fructus huiusmodi percepissee pro mille florenis auri, quos camare solvit, pro ut constare vidi per litteras domini Jacobi de Broa tunc apostolice camere thesaurarii."⁶²

Tithes and other papal taxes. Tithes represented a tenth of the clerics' annual revenues, which had to be paid to the Apostolic Camera. Between 1332 and 1337, a vast action of levying the papal taxes took place in Transylvania and throughout Hungary. Fortunately, the collectors' accounts referring to this area have been preserved, allowing

⁵⁷ *Ibidem*.

⁵⁸ *Ibidem*, p. 263.

⁵⁹ *Ibidem*.

⁶⁰ *Ibidem*, p. 264; *Monumenta Vaticana Hungariae*, I, p. 31.

⁶¹ *Ibidem*, p. 264; *Monumenta Vaticana Hungariae*, I, p. 31.

⁶² *Monumenta Vaticana Hungariae*, I, pp. 430-431.

us to present and analyse the mechanism of collecting this tax. On 1 March 1331, Pope John XXII entrusted this task to Jacob of Berengarius, the manciple of the Benedictine Monastery of Grasse, the Diocese of Carcassonne, and to Raymund of Bonofato, the parish priest of St. Michael's Chapel in the Diocese of Limoges. They also had to investigate whether some amounts of the tithe imposed by the Council of Vienne (1311-1312) for aiding the Holy Land, as well as other papal tithes had been concealed and unreported by those concerned in Hungary.⁶³ In the event that such cases were identified, the collectors were entitled to report them and levy them entirely. To compel the clergy to pay, the collectors could resort, if necessary, to the sentences of interdict and anathema. Interestingly, the pope instructed the two collectors to draw up two certifying documents (receipts), one of which had to be given to the payer, while the other was to reach the Apostolic Camera.⁶⁴

The collection itself involved the local clergy to the highest degree, so the pope addressed himself to all the prelates in Hungary, archbishops, bishops, abbots, priors, deans, provosts, and archdeacons: "we advise, entreat and exhort your community in the name of the Lord and also, by apostolic letter, we command that you should pay, without raising any hindrance or difficulty, from your church income and interests, the above said tithe, which has not been gathered and paid so far to the said [church] for six uninterrupted years."⁶⁵ The Holy Father referred to the tithe established at the Council of Vienne, which was "to be used to help the Holy Land, and, in another way, against the rebels and the enemies of the Catholic faith."⁶⁶ The importance of this collection was highlighted by the pope, in that he invalidated any decision reached by any of his predecessors, which granted any exemption from this tax. Similarly, if anyone was exempted by any court or secular authority, the pope declared the decision null and void. Thus, no one was exempt from paying the six-year tithe as imposed at Vienne.

The collection of the papal taxes was inconceivable without the cooperation and goodwill of the royalty. Aware of this fact, the pope wrote to Charles Robert of Anjou on 18 March 1332, asking him to support the papal collectors.⁶⁷ At the local level, there were other forces that were bound to support the action undertaken by the Holy See. In this respect, Pope John XXII addressed himself, on 1 April 1332, to Voivode Thomas of Transylvania, Comes Pavel of Satu Mare, as well as all the archbishops and bishops of Hungary. They were all requested to help the papal collectors.⁶⁸ Even though the pope's collection order did not need any approval from any secular or ecclesiastical authority, in practice it had to be supported both by the central authority (King Charles Robert of Anjou) and the local rulers (the Voivode of Transylvania and the Comes of Satu Mare). The highest ecclesiastical authorities in Hungary (the two archbishops and the other bishops) were also invited by the pope to offer their good offices to the collectors.

⁶³ *Documente privind istoria României seria C Transilvania, veac. XIV, vol. III (1331-1340)*. Bucharest, Ed. Academiei Române, 1954, p. 4 (hereinafter DIR C, XIV, III).

⁶⁴ *Ibidem*, p. 5.

⁶⁵ *Ibidem*, p. 7.

⁶⁶ *Ibidem*.

⁶⁷ *Ibidem*, pp. 260-261.

⁶⁸ *Ibidem*, pp. 262-263.

Regarding the collection of the papal tithes, this action also included the three Catholic dioceses that today mostly overlap the territory of Romania: Oradea, Cenad and Transylvania. The tithe records offer a broad perspective on the organisation and functioning of the three dioceses. From the beginning, we should mention that all these ecclesiastical units were canonically subject to the Archdiocese of Caloccea. The papal collectors' account books reveal that the Diocese of Transylvanian was divided into 13 archdeaconries (protopopiates), each headed by an archdeacon: Turda, Alba, Ozd, Hunedoara, Cojocna, Târnava, Tylegd, Dăbâca, Solnoc, Crasna, Ugocea, Satu Mare and Chezdi. In terms of the area of jurisdiction, the territorial span of the archdeaconries incorporated Transylvania proper, the Szekler area, and the three counties situated on the north-western border of Transylvania, Crasna, Ugocea and Satu Mare. The payment of the amounts was recorded for each archdeaconry in the papal document, for each of the six years. In the above-mentioned archdeaconries, there was also included a part of the Saxon population, not comprised in the Provostship of Sibiu. Thus, the Archdeaconry of Dăbâca included the Deanery of Bistrița, the Archdeaconry of Ozd included the Deanery of Reghin, the Archdeaconry of Târnava included the Deaneries of Târnava Mare and Târnava Mică, and the Archdeaconry of Alba included the Deaneries of Orăștie, Sebeș, Șpring, Șeica, Laslea, Chizd, Cozd and Mediaș. An examination of the accounts kept for the papal taxes shows that one cannot speak of a unity among the archdeaconries from the Diocese of Transylvania, in terms of the number of parishes. This gives a picture of the spread of Catholicism in the area, especially as regards the Romanian population. Thus, while the Archdeaconry of Turda comprised 29 parishes, the Archdeaconry of Hunedoara had only 9 parishes. It is worth noting that throughout the Middle Ages, Hunedoara was an area predominantly inhabited by the Romanians. The Benedictine Abbey of Cluj-Mănăstur and all its assets were excluded from the jurisdiction of the Transylvanian Diocese. According to the papal tithes records of the years 1332-1337, the Diocese of Oradea included six archdeaconries (protopopiates): Bihor, Bekes, Homorog, Călata, Zeghalm, Coleșer, while the Diocese of Cenad had the following archdeaconries: Timiș, Arad, Cenad, Torontal, Caransebeș, Caraș and the Archdeaconry across the Mureș.

Some of the papal collectors were actively involved in collecting the tithes, as was the case of Jacob of Berengarius, who was attested on 1 and 3 March 1332 in Transylvania, where he levied sums of money from the clergy.⁶⁹ Most of the times, the actual gathering of the tithes was entrusted to subcollectors, like Archdeacon Benedict of Tylegd, Toma, the custodian of the chapter in Alba Iulia, Ioan of Vitus and Ioan of Dominic (1333-1334), Ioan of Vitus and Ioan of Gașpar (1335) from the Diocese of Agria.⁷⁰

As an expression of the important role played by the royalty in the collection of the papal revenues in Hungary, the pope consented, on 1 June 1332, to grant Charles Robert of Anjou a third of all the proceeds from the vacant benefices and the papal tithes collected, but insisted on clarifying the destination of the amounts offered to the Hungarian royalty: "as the Ruthenians and other schismatics and infidels, neighbours

⁶⁹ *Ibidem*, pp. 122-123.

⁷⁰ *Ibidem*, pp. 248, 251.

and yeomen of your kingdom, quite often invade your kingdom and haunt, in all manner of ways, the Christians who live there and whose blood they crave, you, most precious son of ours, you must often make varied and burdensome expenses for defending the kingdom and the aforesaid Christians, and we humbly pray your highness, for a more useful defence [against them] and for curbing those heretics and unbelievers and for the spreading of the true faith in those parts, that we will kindly see, out of our apostolic mercy, to give you help.”⁷¹ The good cooperation between the papacy and the Angevin royalty in the matter of the pontifical tax collection was expressed in the document of 24 November 1332, in which John XXII thanked Charles Robert for the support given to the collectors and requested him to continue to offer them his help.⁷² Benedict XII reiterated his predecessor’s desire and, on 5 August 1335, he asked, in his turn, the Hungarian king to support the papal envoys to Hungary.⁷³

The action of collecting tithes from Hungary did not witness a positive course up to the very end. Thus, on 15 March 1337, Benedict XII appointed a new representative with the collectors in the person of Galhard of Carceribus, “for some matters regarding our treasury in the Kingdom of Hungary.”⁷⁴ He occupied the see of Bishop of Cenad between 1344 and 1345. At the moment of his appointment to the episcopal see of Cenad, Galhard of Carceribus occupied the position of Provost of Titel (now in Vojvodina, the Republic of Serbia), in the Diocese of Caloccea, but he had been ordained only as subdeacon. However, the pope praised the new bishop: “about whose learning, life and noble conduct, wisdom in spiritual matters and watchfulness in the mundane, as well as the other merits of your many virtues trustworthy testimonies have been brought before us.”⁷⁵ In order to have him consecrated as bishop on 3 November 1344, the pope allowed Galhard to be elevated to the rung of priesthood.⁷⁶ Before coming to Hungary, Galhard had been appointed by the papacy as church tax collector in Poland. Here he had distinguished himself through the accuracy of his records and the inflexibility he had demonstrated. As regards his activity as a papal tax collector in Poland, Galhard of Carceribus also had some personal initiatives, which resulted in prejudicing the interests of the Holy See. We refer here to the fact that in 1335, he entrusted the sums of money collected from St. Peter’s mite to some merchants from Krakow, Nicholas Wierzynek and Wigand of Lubczyce, who had to remit them to the banking company in Bruges, which had been approved by the papacy. Still, the destination of those sums remained unknown, despite the repeated appeals made by the popes of Avignon.⁷⁷ Galhard of Carceribus was also involved in Poland’s political affairs, especially with the Teutonic Order, supporting the group of Polish noblemen who wanted the Crown to take a tougher stand against the German knight-monks. In 1339, Galhard presided over the

⁷¹ *Ibidem*, p. 269.

⁷² *Ibidem*, p. 285.

⁷³ *Ibidem*, pp. 356-357.

⁷⁴ *Ibidem*, p. 408.

⁷⁵ *Ibidem*, p. 207.

⁷⁶ *Ibidem*, p. 218.

⁷⁷ Marian Malowist, “Le développement des rapports économiques entre la Flandre, la Pologne et les pays limitrophes du XIII^e au XIV^e siècle,” in *Revue belge de philologie et d’histoire*, tom. 10, fasc. 4, 1931, p. 1039.

trial of the Warsaw case filed by King Casimir III the Great against the Teutonic Order. The trial was conducted from February to September 1339, and Galhard of Carceribus gave a resolution against the Teutonic Order, stipulating that it must return entire Pomerania, together with Dobrzyń and Kuyavia, to Poland.⁷⁸

Galhard's mission in Hungary was to oversee the two papal tax collectors, whom the Holy See suspected of fraud. On 5 February 1338, Benedict XII replaced Jacob of Langres and Jacob of Berengarius as collectors of papal taxes with the Galhard of Carceribus and Peter of Gervasius.⁷⁹ In his action to recover the sums owed to the Holy See by the previous collectors of papal tithes, Benedict XII ordered, on 21 August 1339, that Galhard of Carceribus and Peter of Gervasius should compel, if necessary even by resorting to the assistance of the secular authorities, Jacob of Berengarius and the men of the late Jacob of Langres to uncover the money and the other property they had collected in Hungary on behalf of the church and the Apostolic Camera, since, despite the steps taken, they had given no account of those sums to the Holy See and the Pontifical Camera. The new papal envoys were urged to trace the property they had deposited or that was owed to them, which would be found in the possession of others, and were granted power to give absolution and exemption for the amounts that the depositories would hand over to them.⁸⁰ This papal document issued by Benedict XII reveals two aspects, *primo*: the initial collectors of papal taxes were suspected of fraud and theft; *secundo*: to discover the truth, the pope appointed reliable people as new collectors, who were also in charge with the investigation of the accused. In other words, the future Bishop of Cenad was a close collaborator of the papal court in Avignon.

On 14 March 1340, Pope Benedict XII granted Galhard of Carceribus and Peter of Gervasius the right to absolve from ecclesiastical penalties those who had not paid the papal tithes on time,⁸¹ and he also gave them the mission to subpoena Jacob of Berengarius, the former papal collector, to trial by the Holy See.⁸² Galhard of Carceribus played a particularly important role for the Holy See in Hungary, by shedding light on the action of collecting tithes and recovering the outstanding amounts, but also by investigating the former collector, Jacob of Berengarius. It is very likely that he received the dignity of Bishop of Cenad following his successful completion of the papal missions assigned to him. Still, Galhard did not last too long on the episcopal see of Cenad, since he was transferred to Veszprém in 1345 (1345-1346).⁸³ In 1346, Galhard of Carceribus entered a conflict with King Louis of Anjou, and he was transferred, by papal decree, to the position of Archbishop of Brindisi, in southern Italy. He died in Nîmes on 30 May 1348.

⁷⁸ Norman Housley, *The Avignon Papacy and the Crusades 1305-1378*, Clarendon Press, Oxford, 2002, p. 278; Irena Sułkowska-Kuraś, Stanisław Kuraś, *La Pologne et la papauté d'Avignon, Aux origines de l'état moderne. Le fonctionnement administrative de la papauté d'Avignon*. Actes de la table ronde organisée par l'école française de Rome avec le concours du CNRS, du Conseil général de Vaucluse et de l'Université d'Avignon, École Française de Rome, Palais Farnèse, 1990, pp. 117-118.

⁷⁹ DIR C, XIV, III, p. 439.

⁸⁰ *Ibidem*, p. 510.

⁸¹ *Ibidem*, p. 531.

⁸² *Ibidem*, p. 532.

⁸³ *Monumenta Romana Episcopatus Vesprimiensis*, tomus II 1276-1415, Budapest, 1899, p. 109.

On 6 May 1337, the new envoy to Hungary appointed by Benedict XII was Peter of Gervasius, the Canon of Viviers. He had the task “to inspect the state of the affairs regarding the treasury in Hungary and to take the measures that would be necessary for carrying out” the action of collecting the tithes, and was entitled to impart sentences of interdict and excommunication to those who opposed him or rebelled.⁸⁴ In another deed issued on the same date, the pope urged the other envoys to Hungary, Galhard of Carceribus, Jacob of Langres and Jacob of Berengarius to inform the new papal messenger, “without concealing or fabricating anything,” about the sums collected. The pope commanded his four envoys from Hungary to pay the money from the tithes to the Venice branch of the Acciaiuoli Company in Florence, which would deliver it to the Apostolic Camera. For this purpose, Benedict XII asked the support of King Charles Robert of Anjou and of Queen Elizabeth.⁸⁵

Through his actions, the pope wished to establish greater control over the collectors of tithes, appointing two other envoys, Galhard of Carceribus and Peter, Canon of Viviers. These papal actions lead us to believe that Pope Benedict XII wanted to ensure that the money collected would reach the Apostolic Camera and, to this end, he desired that additional control should be exerted.

On 5 February 1338, Benedict XII replaced Jacob of Langres and Jacob of Berengarius with Galhard of Carceribus and Peter, Canon of Viviers, as collectors of the papal tithes in Hungary.⁸⁶ The reason for this decision is found in a document issued by the pope in Avignon, bearing the same date. Benedict XII rebuked Jacob of Langres and Jacob of Berengarius because despite his command, they had not presented themselves before the papal see to account for the mission that they had carried out in Hungary. The pope stated that the two had not supported him and had not handed over to Galhard of Carceribus, as they had been demanded, the account records and the documents referring to the amounts collected. The two collectors were removed from their positions and replaced, being summoned by the pope to unhesitatingly carry out the orders issued by the new envoy, Peter, Canon of Viviers.⁸⁷ We have reason to believe that the severe attitude displayed by the pope in this document was dictated by some mistakes committed by the two initial collectors of tithes. Perhaps they had been tempted by the amounts collected and had appropriated some of them, which caused the pope's anger. This reprehensible act, if it was committed, led to their replacement with two other trusted collectors of the pope. A possible theft might be suggested by the fact that Jacob of Langres and Jacob of Berengarius refused to hand over the documents they had drafted to the new collectors and that they refused to answer to the pope. On 7 February 1338, the pope addressed himself again to the King and Queen of Hungary, asking them to give their support in order for the collected tithes to arrive safely in the Apostolic treasury.

The suspicion hanging over the first two collectors of tithes in Hungary was confirmed once again by the pope on 21 August 1339, when he addressed himself to

⁸⁴ DIR C, XIV, I, p. 412.

⁸⁵ *Ibidem*, pp. 412-413.

⁸⁶ *Ibidem*, p. 439.

⁸⁷ *Ibidem*, p. 440.

Galhard of Carceribus and Peter, Canon of Viviers, who were demanded to compel - if necessary by resorting to the secular authorities - Jacob of Berengarius and the men of Jacob of Langres, who had died in the meantime, to identify the sums of money and the other goods they had collected in Hungary, on behalf of the church. About this, the pope stated that the former collectors had not answered either to the Holy See or to the two new papal envoys to Hungary. Those amounts and goods had to be identified and returned to the papal treasury as soon as possible.⁸⁸

The collection of papal tithes was not to the liking of the believers in Hungary, whether they belonged to the clergy or the laity. Their failure to pay their due contribution on time entailed ecclesiastical penalties. Meeting the needs of the faithful in Hungary and aiming for the salvation of their souls, the pope authorised the two new collectors of taxes to absolve from punishments those who fulfilled their pecuniary obligations to the Holy See, even if they did so at a later date.⁸⁹

The papacy could not forget about these revenues, because their collection symbolised, at the level of the collective perception in Hungary and elsewhere, that kingdom's submission and obedience to the Apostolic See. While in the previous centuries the sign of a secular prince's submission to the pope had been the oath of allegiance, the pledge of fidelity submitted in the consecrated formula of any vassalage contract, in the fourteenth century this practice was supplanted by the fiscal factor and the financial aspects owed to the Holy See. That is why the pope did not want to leave the case of Jacob of Berengarius in abeyance, and on 14 March 1340, Benedict XII wrote to Galhard of Carceribus and Peter, Canon of Viviers, who had meanwhile also become Canon of Le Puy, to find the culprit and summon him before the Apostolic See so that he could account for the revenues he had not delivered to the Apostolic Camera.⁹⁰

The action for collecting the papal tithes between the years 1332-1337 had the following end result: the amounts collected in the Diocese of Transylvania included 1,835 silver marks, 3 silver pieces, 3 groschen and one denier, 1,170 marks of which were paid by Bishop Andrei of Transylvania and the rest by the parish clergy. Adding the amount corresponding to the Diocese of Transylvania to the sum collected from the Diocese of Oradea, a total of 3,247 marks, 3 vierdungs, 10 groschen and two deniers⁹¹ was obtained, the equivalent of 12,991 florins. With this amount, one could buy 78,000 bushels⁹² of wheat at that time. Across Hungary, 9,385 marks were collected, a third of which went to King Charles Robert of Anjou.⁹³ From the Diocese of Cenad, the papal taxes were collected over a period of three years 1333-1335, the amount levied being 76 marks, 3 vierdungs, 3 and a half groschen.⁹⁴

⁸⁸ *Ibidem*, p. 510.

⁸⁹ *Ibidem*, p. 531.

⁹⁰ *Ibidem*, p. 532.

⁹¹ *Ibidem*, p. 221.

⁹² In the Middle Ages, a bushel was an instrument used to measure the volume of cereals (wheat, barley, oats), beans, peas and onions. There was a small bushel, which was the equivalent of 37.356 litres, and a large bushel, measuring 74.712 litres. Cf. Nicolae Stoicescu, *Cum măsurau strămoșii: metrologia medievală*. Bucharest, Ed. Științifică, 1971, pp. 221-224.

⁹³ Camil Mureșan, G.S. Ardeleanu, "La politique fiscale de la papauté en Transylvanie au cours de la première moitié du XIV^e siècle," in *Nouvelles études d'histoire*, Bucharest, 1955, p. 235.

⁹⁴ DIR, C, XIV, III, p. 248.

The subsequent documents issued by the chancery of the Avignon popes suggest that this sum did not represent the entire amount of the tithes owed by the clergy in Transylvania to the Holy See. On 3 May 1344, Pope Clement VI appointed Arnold de La Caucina, Canon of the Church of Titel from the Archdiocese of Caloccea, as envoy of the Apostolic See to Hungary and Poland, with the mission of collecting the outstanding debts for the papal tithes over a period of 6 years (1332 - 1337) from these kingdoms and their neighbouring areas.⁹⁵ For the same purpose, the new Bishop of Cenad, Galhard of Carceribus, was appointed on 3 November 1344: he had to verify the accounts of the tithe collectors sent by Popes John XXII and Benedict XII to Hungary, Poland and Bohemia. To carry out his duties, the Bishop of Cenad could resort, if need be, to the help of the secular power and issue the ecclesiastical sentences of anathema and interdict.⁹⁶ No details about the action of the two papal collectors appointed by Clement VI have been preserved.

Any cleric appointed by the pope to a vacant benefice was obliged to pay the tax called *annates* to the Holy See. This was the equivalent of the income for the first year from that benefice. Information about the collection of this tax on the territory of the three Transylvanian dioceses may be found out from the papal collectors' sparse records. Thus for the years 1350-1354, Arnold de La Caucina raised 4,739 florins in Hungary, but this money came from the income for the first year (*annates*) of the vacant benefices from the Dioceses of: Esztergom, Caloccea, Transylvania, Pécs, Sirmiu, Zabgreb, Vaț, Veszprém, Agria, Oradea, Cenad, Nitra, Győr and Bosnia.⁹⁷ In another record referring to the papal collections, Arnold de La Caucina said that he had taken 436½ florins from Transylvania, but the money had come from different sources. Thus, Nicolae of Valentin, Archdeacon of Ugocea, paid 32 florins, Dominic of Zeche, the Provost of the Church of Transylvania, paid an aid of 400 florins against the Ottomans, which represented the condition laid by the pope in order to confirm him to the position of Provost of Transylvania, while Fr. Ioan from Daia Săsească paid 4½ florins, representing his debt for the tithe of the years 1332-1337.⁹⁸ From the Diocese of Oradea, Arnold levied the following amounts (*annates*): from a vacant canonry granted to Ștefan of Laurențiu, 40 florins had been paid; Filip of Boda from Târcaia, who was appointed Provost of Oradea, following Cardinal Bertrand's relinquishment of this position, paid 175 florins; Ladislau of Grigore, who was appointed cantor in Oradea, paid 33 florins to the papal collector and, following the vacancy of a canonry that the same cardinal had given up, the new holder, Iacob yclept the Noble paid 40 florins.⁹⁹

From the Diocese of Cenad, Arnold collected 40 florins paid by Albertus Ulrici for his appointment as a lecturer, a vacant position following the death of Petru of Dominic, and another 49 florins paid by Ioan of Henric, Archdeacon of Arad, for his appointment as Provost of St. Albert's Church in the Diocese of Győr.¹⁰⁰

⁹⁵ *Documente privind istoria României seria C Transilvania, veac. XIV, vol. IV (1341-1350)*. Bucharest, Ed. Academiei Române, 1955, p. 183 (hereinafter DIR, C, XIV, IV).

⁹⁶ *Ibidem*, p. 218.

⁹⁷ *Ibidem*, p. 221.

⁹⁸ *Ibidem*, p. 221; *Monumenta Vaticana Hungariae*, I, 443-444.

⁹⁹ *Monumenta Vaticana Hungariae*, I, pp. 449-450.

¹⁰⁰ *Ibidem*, p. 450; *Documenta Romaniae Historica, seria C, Transilvania, vol. X (1351-1355)*. Bucharest, Ed. Academiei Române, 1977, p. 1.

Referring to the other amounts collected by Arnold de La Caucina, an incomplete note for the years 1359-1363 has been preserved. The money recorded by the papal collector came from the remainders and the *annates* of the benefices in Hungary (from the town and Diocese of Esztergom, the Dioceses of Calocsa, Transylvania, Veszprém, Agria, Oradea, Sirmiu and Győr): he levied 1,519½ florins, less than eight Hungarian deniers, which was the equivalent of a Bohemian groschen. The collector considered that the amount of 839½ florins was owed from Hungary, from the remainders of the benefices bestowed there by the Apostolic See and for which confirmation had been granted, that is, those from the towns and Dioceses of Esztergom, Transylvania, Veszprém, Agria and Sirmiu.¹⁰¹ Of course, breaking down that amount by dioceses was impossible, according to the testimony of the papal collector. The amount was considered globally, for all the dioceses that had various outstanding debts to the Holy See. To the sums recorded by Arnold de La Caucina, another 2,000 florins were added for the benefices from the Archdeaconry of Torontal in the Diocese of Cenad.¹⁰²

The analysis of the documents relating to fourteenth-century Transylvania which cover aspects related to the papal taxation highlights the success registered by the monetary economy to the detriment of economy in kind, which had been widely practiced until then. The catalyst of this phenomenon was King Louis of Anjou, who demanded, on 20 September 1352, that the payment of the tithes due to the diocese and the chapter of Transylvania should be made in cash and not in kind.

The good relations between Louis of Anjou and the Holy See were also expressed through the concession of the papal tithes to the Angevin king for certain periods of time. Thus on 11 August 1357, Innocent VI ordered the prelates in Hungary to collect and pay to the king the church tithes owed to the pope for three years. The destination of this money was clearly stated by the pope: the fight against the enemies of the church, the Tatars, the Lithuanians, the Ruthenians, the Serbs, the heretics and the schismatics from Hungary's borders. The pope also stated that the payment had to be made in the currency circulating in the country.¹⁰³ In this way, the tithes were used, at least theoretically, also in the interest of the Roman Church, in the action of Christianising some pagans or attracting the schismatics to the Roman rite.

The last two popes from Avignon, Urban V (1362-1370) and Gregory XI (1370-1378), tightened the fiscal policy, since they needed funds to fight against the enemies of the church, especially those in Italy. This was also noticeable in Hungary and, implicitly, in Transylvania. Thus on 29 February 1364, Urban V requested King Louis of Anjou to support the collectors of papal tithes who had been sent to Hungary to collect this tax from the prelates and other church people. In his letter, the pope complained that the clergymen refused to pay the tithe and urged them to deliver the payment of this tax.¹⁰⁴

¹⁰¹ *Documenta Romaniae Historica, seria C, Transilvania, vol. XI (1356-1360)*. Bucharest, Ed. Academiei Române, 1981, p. 344 (hereinafter DRH C, XI); *Monumenta Vaticana Hungariae*, I, pp. 452-453.

¹⁰² *Ibidem*, p. 453.

¹⁰³ DRH, C, XI, p. 166.

¹⁰⁴ *Documenta Romaniae Historica, seria C, Transilvania, vol. XII (1361-1365)*. Bucharest, Ed. Academiei Române, 1985, p. 230.

Gregory XI continued his predecessor's line and on 15 April 1372, he requested the Hungarian king to help Ilie of Vodronio, the collector of the one-year tithe exacted by the papacy on the church revenues from Hungary and Poland for the war against Bernabo Visconti, the leader of Milan, who persecuted the church.¹⁰⁵

The firmness of the papal command prompted the Hungarian clergy to fulfil their obligations to the Holy See. Concerning the amounts levied following the imposition of this tithe, information is found in the document kept by the papal envoy, Peter of Stephen, who acted in Hungary between 1373 and 1375. He had the mission of collecting both the tithes and the revenues from the vacant ecclesiastical benefices in Hungary. Insofar as the Diocese of Transylvania was concerned, Bishop Dumitru (1368-1376)¹⁰⁶ paid 850 florins for himself and 1,545 florins for his clergy as papal tithes.¹⁰⁷ It should be noted that the Diocese of Transylvania paid on this occasion the highest taxes of all the Catholic suffragan dioceses of Caloceia which are now on the territory of Romania. By comparison, Bishop Dominic of Cenad (1360-1373) paid 214 florins for himself and 40 deniers and 218 florins for his clergy, while Bishop Dominic of Oradea (1373-1374) paid 303 florins for himself and 121 florins in old deniers, 79 gold florins and 30 Hungarian deniers for his clergy.¹⁰⁸ Peter of Stephen accurately recorded in his books the situation of the vacant benefices from Hungary for the fourth, fifth and sixth year of Urban V's pontificate, as well as for the first four years of Gregory XI's pontificate. In what follows, we shall present this situation, as recorded by the papal collector in the Dioceses of Oradea, Cenad and Transylvania.

Throughout Hungary, Peter of Stephen collected 1,169 florins and a half from the benefices.¹⁰⁹ The analysis of the information from this papal tithe register shows that the ingenious fiscal mechanism devised by the popes of Avignon expanded to the eastern border of *Christianitas*. The end result of the collection of papal taxes from the three dioceses was, between 1373 and 1375, as follows: from the Diocese of Oradea, 132 florins were collected, from that of Cenad - 120 florins, and from that of Transylvania - 315 florins. This reveals that the Diocese of Transylvania contributed the largest amount to the papal treasury, followed by the Dioceses of Oradea and Cenad. This ranking was identical with that from the period 1332-1337 as regards the papal tithes. This demonstrates a certain consistency in terms of the economic situation of the clergy from the three dioceses during the fourteenth century. Based on these data, we may say that the clergy in Transylvania had a better economic-financial situation, while the clergy from the Diocese of Cenad had a more difficult financial situation.

Towards the end of his pontificate, Gregory XI imposed a new tithe. On 5 December 1377, the pontiff ordered the Archbishops of Esztergom and Caloceia that as

¹⁰⁵ *Documenta Romaniae Historica, seria C, Transilvania, vol. XIV (1371-1375)*. Bucharest, Ed. Academiei Române, 2002, p. 161 (hereinafter DRH C, XIV).

¹⁰⁶ Bishop Dumitru was the most important Bishop of Transylvania in the fourteenth century. In 1376, he was transferred as Bishop of Zagreb, and later he became Archbishop of Esztergom and Primate of Hungary (1378-1387), with the broad support of King Louis I of Anjou. In the Consistory of 18 October 1378, Pope Urban VI made Dumitru Cardinal-Priest of the Church of Quattro Santi Coronati in Rome.

¹⁰⁷ DRH C, XIV, p. 303.

¹⁰⁸ *Ibidem*; *Monumenta Vaticana Hungariae*, I, pp. 456-457.

¹⁰⁹ *Monumenta Vaticana Hungariae*, I, p. 520.

of 1 January 1378, they should levy the tithes for two years. The pope also established the dates for the payment of the amounts: the Calends of April (1 April) and the feast of the Assumption of the Blessed Virgin (15 August). Exempt from the payment of this tithe were: the cardinals, the masters, the priors, the preceptors and the brothers of the Order of St. John of Jerusalem and the Order of St. Mary of the Teutons, because they battled against the enemies of the Christian faith.¹¹⁰ Internal documents do not mention anything about the amounts levied in Transylvania on this occasion.

Other pontifical taxes. The tithes and the revenues collected from the vacant benefices were not the only taxes paid by the clergy to the Holy See. Each new Catholic bishop who was appointed to a diocese had the obligation to pay a confirmation fee, called *servitia communia*. The sum was meant for the Apostolic Camera, but the new bishop also had to pay any outstanding amounts of his predecessors in the episcopal see. According to a record dating, according to the editors of the document, from the time of John XXII's pontificate (1316-1334), the situation of the *servitia communia* owed by the bishops was as follows: the Bishop of Oradea had to pay 2,000 florins, the one of Transylvania 1,500, and the one of Cenad 900.¹¹¹ Information about the payment of this fee is extremely scarce for the territory of the three aforementioned dioceses. There are some documents, especially referring to the Diocese of Cenad. Thus, Grigore II of Cenad (1345-1350), who admitted, on 19 May 1345, the debts of his predecessors, Galhard of Carceribus (1344-1345), who had to pay 900 florins and 5 solidi, and Ștefan II (1343-1344), who owed 400 florins and 5 solidi.¹¹² These sums owed to the Holy See reveal the scrupulousness with which the popes from Avignon kept track of the money had to receive from the various dioceses of Christendom. This was also an effective means of centralising the pontifical government of the church, but it generated fierce discontent and criticism, which eventually generated protest movements. There is no testimony in the internal documents about such fees being paid by the Transylvanian bishops, but this does not mean that they were not paid. Each newly elected bishop had this duty to the Apostolic See.

Another tax owed to the papacy was the *pallium* tax, which only the archbishops had to pay. In the fourteenth century, there was no bishop in Transylvania who became an archbishop, but interesting in this regard was the case of Bishop Toma of Cenad. On 25 August 1358, he was appointed by Pope Innocent VI as Archbishop of Caloccea.¹¹³ The new archbishop requested the *pallium* from the pope through Conrad, Archdeacon of Nitra, his envoy to the court of Avignon. It was only in December 1358 that Innocent VI sent Toma the *pallium* through Nicolae, the Provost of the church from Hont, so that it could be granted to him by the Bishop of Oradea or of Sirmiu, who were to receive, in

¹¹⁰ *Documenta Romaniae Historica, seria C, Transilvania, vol. XV (1376-1380)*. Bucharest, Ed. Academiei Române, 2006, p. 351 (hereinafter DRH C, XV).

¹¹¹ DIR C, XIV, I, p. 253. The sums indicated in this document also appear in Borovszky Samu, *Csanád vármegye története 1715-ig*. Budapest, A Magyar tudományos Akadémia Palotájában, 1896, p. 353, cited by Koloman Juhász, *Ein Italienischer Arzt Als Ungarischer Bischof Giacomo da Piacenza († 1348)* in *Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie*, Band 80 (1958), Heft 4, p. 571.

¹¹² DIR, C, XIV, IV, p. 242.

¹¹³ DRH, C, XI, p. 316.

the pope's name, the oath of allegiance of the Archbishop of Caloccea.¹¹⁴ On this occasion, the *pallium* tax was paid, the amount of which is not mentioned in the documents.

The taxes the bishops owed to the pope were not revoked on the appointment of a new bishop. It was the duty of the recently appointed hierarch to pay the Holy See any outstanding amounts of his predecessors. Again, documents are silent as regards Transylvania, but we may get an idea by studying the case of the Diocese of Cenad. Thus on 10 March 1361, Innocent VI confirmed Dominic as Bishop of Cenad.¹¹⁵ In September 1362, Dominic paid his confirmation fee of 80 florins and 23 solidi through Gaucelmus, Bishop of Nîmes and the papal legate to Hungary.¹¹⁶ On 5 May 1367, the same bishop paid the Holy See, through Iacob, the church lecturer from Cenad, 88 florins, 55 solidi and 6 deniers, representing the confirmation fee of his predecessor, Grigore.¹¹⁷ On the same date, Dominic paid another 5 florins and 53 solidi, completing his own confirmation fee.

On 26 February 1377, another Bishop of Cenad, Pavel (1377-1379), undertook to pay the ordinary sum to the Apostolic Camera, on the occasion of his appointment. This amount (*servicium communae*) amounted to 165 florins and it could be paid in two instalments.¹¹⁸

Through this fiscal policy, the Holy See imposed its control over the local churches, the bishops being left with no choice but to pay the due amounts if they wished to preserve their position and not to be anathemised or have their dioceses put under an ecclesiastical interdict. The taxes were scrupulously recorded by the Apostolic Camera, the bishops being also obliged to pay the debts of their predecessors.

Final considerations. During the Avignon papacy, the Catholic clergy of Transylvania was incorporated into the vast mechanism of papal fiscality. Thus, throughout the fourteenth century, Transylvania was visited by a series of papal collectors who levied, on behalf of the French pontiffs, the various taxes exacted by the latter. In this respect the most important action was the collection of tithes from 1332-1337, in relation to which a document of paramount importance for the history of Transylvania, the register of papal tithes, has been preserved. Papal taxation could not have operated in this border area of the Christian world without the support of the Angevin monarchy, which appropriated some of the amounts collected, with the assent of the French pontiffs. Notwithstanding all this, the collection of papal revenues had a negative impact on both the clergy and the laity.

¹¹⁴ *Ibidem*, p. 341.

¹¹⁵ DRH, C, XII, p. 18.

¹¹⁶ *Ibidem*, p. 97.

¹¹⁷ DRH, C, XIII, p. 355.

¹¹⁸ DRH, C, XV, p. 130.