

FOREIGN ETHNIC GROUPS AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT IN MEDIEVAL HUNGARY: THE CASE OF TEMESVÁR

István Petrovics

It is a frequently cited statement of Hungarian urban history research that creation of towns taking shape around the turn of the 12th and 13th centuries, and which can be regarded - as a result of the appearance of money economy and royal privileges - in fact as *real towns*, foreign settlers (*hospites*) contributed to a great extent⁽¹⁾.

The *hospites* in the 11th and 12th centuries came to the Kingdom of Hungary, in the main, from Flanders, North-France (*Walloons*), Lorraine and Lombardy. As they were Romance speaking people, the Hungarian sources referred to them as *Latini* (*Latins*), or *Gallici* and *Italici*⁽²⁾. They were followed in the 12th and 13th centuries by Germans - *Teutonici* and *Saxones*, respectively - and from the second part of the 13th century German ascendancy became obvious in most of the towns of the Hungarian Kingdom⁽³⁾.

The *hospites* belonging to diverse ethnic groups and coming from different regions of Europe arrived in Hungary in several waves and brought with them their legal system, which at many points was more developed than the Hungarian one. The legal system of the *hospites* (*libertas / ius hospitum*) which formed the basis of town laws in Hungary - in other words: municipal liberties in Hungary grew out of the privileges of the foreign guests, and can be regarded as the expanded versions of the *libertas hospitum* that was appelled to urban branches of professions - is not to be treated as a pure German law⁽⁴⁾. Nevertheless, the above statement does not contradict the fact that Germans (Saxons) contributed decisively to the creation of town laws in Hungary.

The study of privileges bestowed by Hungarian kings on foreign settlers and burghers draws attention upon some important facts. The first and most important point to stress is that guests enjoyed several privileges already in their original homeland, which were respected, what is more, in many cases essentially expanded by the Hungarian kings. In this respect it is very astonishing that the *hospites* in Hungary could freely elect their *judge* (*iudex*) and priest, what the burghers of most Western European towns to miss⁽⁵⁾.

In western Europe, primarily on the territory of the Holy Roman Empire, as a consequence of the lack of the aforesaid privilege which secured the free election of the judge, a strange situation came into being: the activity of town administration and that of passing on urban burghers became separated from each other. This meant in practice that the towns were directed by two officials: the *judge* (*imperial schulteis*) appointed by the monarchs (kings, emperors etc.) whose task was to pass

sentences and the *lord mayor* (*magister civium*, *bürgermeister*) elected by the burghers of the town who administered the settlement⁽⁶⁾.

The townsfolk desperately strove for changing this unfavourable situation: the most important imperial towns like Nürnberg, Frankfurt and Regensburg could finally redeem the right of the free election of the judge in the 14th and 15th centuries, and even then for a considerable amount of money⁽⁷⁾.

In contrast to this, in Hungary it was the *judge* (*iudex*) elected by the burghers who was the real headman of most Hungarian towns. The judge together with the *alderman* (*iurati cives*), who were also elected by the burghers, passed - in the name of the king - sentences, administered the town, and directed the economic activity of the settlement⁽⁸⁾.

Nevertheless, in the town of Western Hungary and in the *oppida* which were located in their vicinity, as a result of Austrian impact *bürgermeister*-s can be found as leaders of the settlements⁽⁹⁾.

The same situation can be observed in case of the *Saxon towns* in Transylvania. This is explained by the fact that the practice according to which the *royal judge* (*iudex regium / regalis*) was not elected by the Saxons themselves, but appointed by the king, survived until the late 15th century. It was only in 1477 when King Matthias ordered that from that time on the royal judges (*judices regales*) were to be freely elected by the Saxons⁽¹⁰⁾.

The document first referring to the free election of the priest is also associated with the Transylvanian Saxons. This document first is named *Andreanum* after King Andreu II, who issued it for the Saxons in 1224⁽¹¹⁾. It was *Dietrich Kurze*, the outstanding German legal historian, who called attention to the fact that though the *Andreanum* spoke about the free election of the priest for the first time, the Saxons could not bring this privilege with them to Hungary, for the simple reason that at the time of their migration this privilege was not practiced by them in their original homeland. Consequently, this privilege - together with the one which secured the election of the judge - was donated to the Saxons by the Hungarian kings⁽¹²⁾. It is equally important to stress that the *libertas hospitum* in Hungary generally comprised the privilege of electing the priest, consequently this privilege emerges not only in settlements inhabited by Saxons⁽¹³⁾. Speaking about towns, for the sake of comparison, it is worth referring to the case of the Holy Roman Empire, where out of the 3000 towns only 380, i.e. slightly in excess of 10% enjoyed this privilege in contrast to Hungary, where it was a widely spread practice⁽¹⁴⁾.

after settling down in the Hungarian Kingdom the way of life and legal system of the newly arrived guests and those of the Hungarians mutually influenced each other. This interference is also proved by the terminology of the primary source material. Let it suffice here to mention just one example: the term (*libera*) *villa* - due to the influence of the Walloon settlers' language - in Hungary, roughly until the mid-14th century referred not to villages but to urban-type settlements⁽¹⁵⁾. Speaking about terminology it is worth remarking that the same phenomenon can also be observed in *Hungaro-Romanian context*, i.e. many Romanian words concerning urban life are Hungarian loanwords: *oraş* < *város*, *pîrgar* < *polgár*, *bâlciu* < *búcsú/vásár*, *vamă* < *vám* etc⁽¹⁶⁾.

Nevertheless, the term *hospes* should be treated very carefully, as its meaning changed from time to time. In the 11th century law-books this term referred to *foreign* knights and clerics, but it also alluded to peasants (serfs/villains) who migrated to Hungary in the early Árpadian age. From the 13th century on the term *hospes* primarily did not refer to *foreign immigrants*, but to such persons who during the process of colonisation acquired a special legal status⁽¹⁷⁾. This fundamental change meant that anybody enjoying that special legal status - regardless of ethnic origins - could be referred to as *hospes*, i.e. besides the Latins and Germans Hungarians, Armenians and Slavic people were also among the *hospites*. As the guests comprised both peasants and artisans (merchants), their *libertas* had an impact, on one hand, on the formation of the *libertas* of the social class of dependant peasants who enjoyed a more or less uniform legal status, and on the other, on the evolution of town laws⁽¹⁸⁾. Consequently, it is not by chance that in the Latin language Hungarian documents it is the term *hospes* and not *civis* which initially referred to urban burghers. As from the middle of the 13th century on the members of the social class of dependant peasants who enjoyed a more or less uniform legal status were frequently named *hospites*, the new term of *civis* (*cives*) emerged for the designation of burghers. The most commonly used phrase of the charters referring to burghers was: *cives et hospites*. Nevertheless, the term *civis* (*cives*), at first was used in a narrower sense, as it alluded solely to the most influential group of urban society, primarily to the *iurati cives*. This duality is well exemplified by the expression *cives et concives*, in which the latter refers to the *originary burghers* of the town⁽¹⁹⁾.

In the present stage of research - based primarily but not exclusively on published documents - it can be stated that the first charter using a collective designation referring to the burghers of Temesvár was issued by the chapter house of Arad (today: Arad, Romania) in 1341⁽²⁰⁾. The charter dated on May 19 uses the term *hospites de Temeswar*. Not quite a year later, on February 9, 1342 the chapter house of Csanád (today: Cenad, Romania) issued a charter in which mention is made of the *cives de Temeswar*⁽²¹⁾. A distinguished part of the townsfolk in Temesvár, namely the merchants, *mercatores de (nostra civitate) Temeswar*, appear in King Sigismund's charter issued on January 13, 1415 and in the charter of Nicolas Csádi, voivode of Transylvania, issued on September 15 in the same year⁽²²⁾. The first burghers of the town who are unequivocally known by their name emerge in documentary evidences in 1361⁽²³⁾. The charter issued by Queen Elisabeth on August 31, 1361 in Visegrád tells that two burghers from Temesvár, *Valentinus filius Michaelis et Vehul (Utl?) dictus de Somplijo cives de Themeswar*, victims of a violent trespass, confirm that magister Benedictus filius Pauli filii heyms, the landlord of Blasius Rufus, the tributarius who took away, by force, the things belonging to Michael and Vehul, gave them everything back. From the 15th century onwards the number of such documents increases in which the burghers of Temesvár are mentioned by their name. In these cases the christian name of the burghers emerges in conjunction with that of their fathers or with the designation of their profession. The aforesaid two variants - either separately or together - were sometimes also combined with the name of the town of Temesvár: *Valentinus filius Michaelis et*

Vehul (Utul?) dictus de Somlijo cives Themeswar (1361), Sebastianus Georgii de Themesuar (1400), Johannes corrigiator de Themeswar (1411), Andreas de Themeswar (1446)⁽²⁴⁾. When examining either the collective designation or the individual names of the burghers, the question is raised: were there any foreign ethnic groups which played a significant role in the urban development of Temesvár in the Middle Ages?

It can be stated for sure that research based exclusively on the above mentioned types of names can not clarify this problem properly, and other kinds of primary sources and also the application of special methods are required when investigating this complex question. The case of nearby Szeged, a town located at the confluence of rivers Tisza and Maros with which Temesvár had tight contacts, may offer an analogy to the study of the past of Temesvár⁽²⁵⁾. The hospites of Szeged are mentioned in documentary evidences for the first time in 1247. They are referred to - just like the guests of Temesvár - with a collective denomination: *hospites de Zegedino*⁽²⁶⁾. These guests were probably Hungarians as no written records are known concerning the medieval history of Szeged which speak about Latins or Germans. In case of Szeged a very important document survived which may help to clarify the ethnic structure and demographic condition of the town, at least, concerning the period between the late 15th and early 16th century. This is a decimal list produced in 1522 which contains the names of the streets and inhabitants of the town⁽²⁷⁾. On the basis of sporadic names preserved in documentary evidences, different data concerning urban administration, and the geographical location of the town it seems very probable that the hospites and the inhabitants of Temesvár were, prior to the 15th century, *preponderantly* Hungarians. This contention further supported by the case of nearby Szeged.

In contrast to a former assertion⁽²⁸⁾ I find it very doubtful that there had been a Walloon colony in Temesvár, for the simple reason that the first emergence of the patronage of St. Eligius is rather late (1394)⁽²⁹⁾. Not to mention the fact that the parish church in Temesvár was the only *ecclesia* in medieval Hungary to have had St. Eligius as its patron saint, though there were several urban type settlements in Hungary where Walloon hospites had lived in a significant number.

As far as I can determine it is the Anjou period of the history of Temesvár, in which the veneration of St. Eligius originates. It is a well-known fact that Charles I of the Anjou dynasty had his court in this town from 1315 to 1323, when it moved to Visegrád⁽³⁰⁾. Among the secular and ecclesiastical lords of the royal court, were several Italians, who might have had a role in spreading the cult of St. Eligius in Hungary. Based on the fact that a hospital dedicated to St. Eligius worked in Naples in the 14th century, it can be stated that Eligius was a popular saint in that town as well⁽³¹⁾. On the other hand, it is also worth mentioning that Charles I established a Franciscan monastery in nearby Lippa which was dedicated to his uncle, St. Louis Bishop of Toulouse, canonized in 1317⁽³²⁾. This fact draws attention to the circumstance that veneration of St. Eligius in Temesvár might have also been spread by Charles I himself, or someone else belonging to his court.

It should also be stressed that in the 13th and 14th centuries very intensive economic and cultural contacts existed between Italy and Hungary⁽³³⁾. Based on

these facts, we have good reason to believe that several Italians appeared in Temesvár, especially in the royal court, in the first part of the 14th century. Their number, however, might have drastically dropped when the royal court moved to Visegrád in 1323. It was characteristic of the Italians showing up in Hungary in the 14th century that beside acting as merchants they were basically engaged in the financial and mining administration of the kingdom. It is true, however, that at the end of the 14th century the indolent Italian businessmen could hardly compete with the German entrepreneurs who quite unexpectedly invaded the realm⁽³⁴⁾. Some Italians who started their career in Hungary as merchants, later became feudal lords (barons)⁽³⁵⁾. Let it suffice here to refer only to one such person, Filippo Scolari (by his Hungarian name Pipo Ozorai), born in the vicinity of Florence, who became King Sigismund's most active and triumphant general. Ozorai's life and military activity was tightly connected with Temesvár as he became the royal officer in charge of Temes county (*comes Temesiensis*) in 1404⁽³⁶⁾.

After the overwhelming Turkish victory at Nicopolis in 1396 Temesvár and the region around it became the permanent target of Ottoman onslaughts⁽³⁷⁾. It was basically the task of the baron actually holding the office of *comes Temensiensis* to establish an effective defence-system in this area against the Turks. Especially Pipo Ozorai and Pál Kinizsi, as *comites Temensiesis* played an outstanding role in defending the southern parts of Hungary, and János Hunyadi, voivode of Transylvania, respectively, who between 1441 and 1456 had one of his seats in Temesvár⁽³⁸⁾.

As a result of the Ottoman advance, Temesvár became a so called *border castle* by the early 15th century. This evidently hindered its urban development, despite the fact that Pipo Ozorai and János Hunyadi launched significant building operations here. As the building operations were carried out, primarily, in order to fortify the castle and the town, they could not promote, in fact urban development. At the same time the administrative functions of Temesvár were enlarged, since the salt deposit belonging to Keve (today: Kovin, Serbia) was operated by Pipo Ozorai in Temesvár⁽³⁹⁾. This change was achieved in order to offices of *comes Temensiensis* and *comes camerarum salium regalium*, for a while, simultaneously. The son of the patrician of Korčula, Matko Tallóci, together with his three brothers operated the salt deposit belonging to Keve also in Temesvár⁽⁴⁰⁾. The Tallóci brothers were significant figures of the anti-Ottoman struggles as well. At the time of King Sigismund's death the Tallóci brothers supervised the southern line of border fortresses, stretching from the Adriatic coast to the fortress of Szörény and comprising some fifty castles⁽⁴¹⁾. The role Temesvár played in the distribution of salt, may explain the fact that Pero Rossi of Florence, *camerarius salium regalium* from Torda (today: Turda, Romania) had a *sessio* in Temesvár, with he possessed in return of the debt⁽⁴²⁾.

Though the Ottoman advance definitely hindered, it did not halt immediately the urban development of Temesvár in the early 15th century. It is certified, for instance, by a charter surviving from 1413 in which mention is made about a Regusan merchant who died in Temesvár⁽⁴³⁾.

There are also documentary evidences proving that Temesvár played an

important role in the Transylvanian cloth trade in the aforesaid period. This activity was so significant that the town council of Nagyszeben/Hermannstadt (today: Sibiu, Romania) seriously worried about it, and some burghers of Hermannstadt were manhandled in Temesvár⁽⁴⁴⁾. Even the name in Temesvár's first *iudex* known by name: Mihály Posztós (*Mychael dictus Poztos*) refers to the weight this town had in the cloth trade⁽⁴⁵⁾. The person of Mihály Posztós who shows up in written sources first in 1390, creates, at the same time, a contact with the Romanians of this region, who appear in the Temesköz according to the testimony of charters in the 14th century. it is known for sure, for instance, that in 1359 six members of an illustrious Romanian family from Wallachia settled down in the Temesköz (*relictis omnibus possessionibus eorum et bonis in dicta terra Transalpina habitis, nostre maiestati semet ipsos obtulerunt fideliter servituros*). The Hungarian king, Louis I donated 13 vilages to them in order to enable them to accomodate their entourage Six years later another 5 landed estates were donated to them⁽⁴⁶⁾.

The different way of life and customary law to several conflicts with the Hungarians in Transylvania and in the southern parts of the realm. Therefore King Louis I personally appeared in Transylvania in 1366 in order to arrange the problem. This is how first legal regulation of the Hungaro-Romanian coexistence took place⁽⁴⁷⁾.

King Louis I did his best in order to protect the Romanians even after the legal regulation of 1366. This royal intention is clearly demonstrated, for exemple, in a charter which was issued on January 5, 1373: "*Nos Ludovicus Dei gratia rex Hungarie... vobis magistris Petro et Nicolao filiis Heem, item Andree dicto Turma castellano de Mihald, necnon keneziis, officialibus et servientibus vestris universis firmis damus in preceptis, quatenus Ladislaum filium Lelach, Naam et Ladislaum filios Kene Olachos nostros, possessionesque, jobagiones et res ipsorum interium quousque nos personaliter ad Temesuar accedemus, nec intra nec extra iudicium audentis perturbare...*"⁽⁴⁸⁾.

Back to the person of Mihály Posztós, the iudge of Temesvár got involved in a low suit with the Romanians living on the possessions of Kispala and Nagypala (*possessiones Kispala et Noghpala in districtu de Hathzeg*), whose ownership, by royal donation, Mihály Posztós claimed to himself⁽⁴⁹⁾. The case of Kispala and Nagypala well illustrates the situation, namely that under the leadership of Romanian *kenezii*, as a rezult of forest clearing and colonization free villages (*liberae villae*) came into being, among others, in the district of Hátszeg (today: Hațeg, Romania)⁽⁵⁰⁾. The point to stress is the "*ius Kenezorum*" agquired during the process of colonization in itself did not mean that the *kenezii* owned the free villages. It happened frequently that the kings donated these villages, and in such cases the *kenezii* were subjected to the new landlords. On the other hand, several examples prove that the Hungarian kings confirmed those *kenezii* in the possession of free villages for their lives who earned distincion in royal service. In more than one case it happened that by royal favour the *kenezii* could even inherit the free villages. Even in such cases the common Romanians of the free villages could preserv their liberty, in other words they did not become simple peasants, as it was the *judicial bench of the district* which henceforward passed sentences on them. it is important to emphasize since common Romanians, as members, could participate in the work

of the judicial bench of the district⁽⁵¹⁾. Another characteristic feature was that in contrast to the Szeklers who personally fulfilled military service to the kings, from among the Romanians only the *kenezii* had this duty. With the Ottoman advance the military role of the *kenezii* increased significantly. It is not by chance that a large number of *Romanian kenezii* became members of the Hungarian nobility in the early 15th century. In this respect the activity of János Hunyadi, governor of Hungary (1446-'53) was of great importance, who, as a descendant of a *kenez*-family, knew very well this ambitious social stratum.

Though several other examples might be referred to from the medieval history of Temesvár, based to the above discussed cases it can already be stated with a high degree of probability that in contrast to other towns of the realm in Temesvár - like in Szeged - the majority of the inhabitants was constituted by Hungarians, and no populous communities of Walloons, Germans or other foreign ethnic groups played an important role in the development of the town prior to the 15th century. At the same time it also should be stressed that individuals coming from outside the Kingdom of Hungary settled down in Temesvár quite frequently, and as royal officials or merchants contributed to forming the history of this town and region around it.

The documentary evidences also clearly demonstrate that the Ottoman advance caused a great shift in the ethnic make-up of the population of the Temes region. Many of those Hungarians who had survived the brutal Ottoman onslaughts migrated to the central parts of the realm, and to their place, from the 15th century on, a large number of Romanians and Serbs arrived⁽⁵²⁾. The immigrants used, further on, the original Hungarian place-names of the area in question, but obviously adapted them to their own language,

as it is proved by the analysis of the Turkish state-tax returns (*defters*) from the late 16th century⁽⁵³⁾. The above changes taking place in the Temesköz in the Late Middle Ages also had an impact on the ethnic make-up of the town of Temesvár itself, but in lack of secular and/or ecclesiastical conscriptions no precise evaluation can be given concerning the late 15th and early 16th century ethnic composition of the inhabitants of Temesvár.

NOTES:

1. For the summary of the question see the contributions of E. Fügedi, *A városok kialakulása Magyarországon* (*The making of towns in Hungary*) and *Középkori magyar városprivilegiumok* (*Medieval Hungarian urban privileges*); E. Fügedi: *Kolduló barátok, polgárok, nemesek* (*Mendicant friars, burghers, nobles*). Budapest 1981, p.238-335; L.Gerevich (ed.), *Towns in Medieval Hungary*. Budapest 1990; J. Szűcs, *Az utolsó Árpádok* (*The reign of the last Árpadian kings*). Budapest 1993, p.50-61, p.223-226; Gy. Kristó (ed. in chief), *Korai magyar történeti lexikon* (9-14. század) (*Early Hungarian historical lexicon. (9-14th centuries)*). Further on, KMTL. Budapest 1994. s.v. város, hospes.

2. An illustration of the question is presented -among others - by the following scholars; E. Fügedi, Gy. Györffy and Gy. Székely. E. Fügedi, *A befogadó a magyar királyság* (*Hungary as a welcoming kingdom*). In: *Kolduló barátok, polgárok, nemesek*, op.cit., p.398-418; Gy. Györffy, *A*

székesfehérvári latinok betelepülésének kérdése (*The settling down of Latin guests in Székesfehérvár*. In: *Székesfehérvár évszázadai* (*The centuries of Székesfehérvár*) vol.II Székesfehérvár 1972, p.37-44; Gy.Székely, *A székesfehérvári latinok és vallonok a középkori Magyarországon*. (*The Latins and Walloons of Székesfehérvár in medieval Hungary*). In: *Székesfehérvár évszázadai*, op.cit., p.45-72; KMTL s.v. vallonok olaszok.

3. A. Kubinyi, *Zur frage der deutschen Siedlungen im mittleren Teil des Königreichs Ungarn (1200-1541)*. *Vorträge und Forschungen*, Bd. XVIII. 1975, p.527-566; E. Fügedi, op.cit., p.406-418; KMTL s.v. németek, szászok.

4. I. Petrovics, *A korai magyar városfejlődés és az idegen jog* (*Medieval Hungarian urban development and foreign law*). In: *Régi és új peregrináció, magyarok külföldön, külföldiek a magyarországon* (*Id and new peregrination, abroad, foreigners in Hungary. Papers of the IIIrd International Congress on Hungarian Studies*) Szeged 1993, p.267-271; s.v. hospesjog, városi jog.

5. E. Fügedi, *Op.cit.* p. 280-287, 300-305.

6. A. Kubinyi, *Városi szervezetek a középkori Magyarországon* (*Urban organizations in medieval Hungary*) *Honismeret* 21 (1993) No. 6, p. 16-17.

7. A. Kubinyi, *A középkori Magyarország városfejlődése* (*The Urban development of medieval Hungary*) *Rubicon* 4 (1993) Nos. 8-9, p. 17.

8. E. Fügedi, *Op. cit.*, p. 281-300.

9. A. Rubinyi, *Op. cit.* p. 16.

10. For the Saxon towns see, for instance: Gy. Granasztói, *Társadalmi tagozódás Brassóban a XV. század végén* (*Social stratification in Brassó in the late 15th century*). *Századok* (*Centuries*) 106 (1972) p. 305-399; P. Niedermaier, *Siebenbürgische Städte Forschungen zur städtebaulichen und architektonischen Entwicklung von Handwerksorten zwischen dem 12. und 16. Jahrhundert*. Köln 1979; M. Philippi, *Die bürger von Kronstadt im 14. und 15. Jahrhundert. Untersuchungen zur geschichte und sozialstruktur einer Siebenbürgischen stadt im Mittelalter*. Köln-Wien 1986; O. Dahinten, *Geschichte der stadt Bistritz in Siebenbürgen*. Aus dem Nachlaß hrsg. v. E. Wagner. Köln-Wien 1988; K.G. Gündisch, *Das Patriziat Siebenbürgischer städte im Mittelalter*. Köln-Weimar-Wien 1993; I. Draskóczy, *Az erdélyi szász városok* (*The Saxon towns in Transylvania*), *Rubicon*, 4 (1993) Nos. 8-9, p.17.

11. F. Zimmermann - C. Werner, *Urkundenbuch zur Geschichte der Deutschen in Siebenbürgen*. vol. I, Hermannstadt 1892. p. 32-35.

12. D. Kurze, *Pfarrwahlen im Mittelalter. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Gemeinde und des Niederkirchenwesens. Forschungen zur kirchlichen Rechtsgeschichte und zum Kirchenrecht*. Bd. 6, Köln-Graz 1966; D. Kurze, *Zur historischen Einordnung der kirchlichen Bestimmungen des Andreanums. Zur Rechts- und Siedlungsgeschichte der Siebenbürger Sachsen. Siebenbürgisches Archiv. Archiv des Vereins für Siebenbürgische Landeskunde, Dritte Folge*, Bd. 8, Köln-Wien 1971, p. 133-161; D. Kurze, *Hoch- und spätmittelalterliche Wahlen in Niederkirchenbereich als Ausdruck von Rechten, Rechtsansprüchen und als Wege zur Konfliktlösung*; In: R. Schneider - H. Zimmermann (eds.), *Vorträge und Forschungen*. Bd. XXXVII. Sigmaringen 1990. Kurze's views were made known in Hungary primarily by András Kubinyi. See A. Kubinyi, *Plébánosválasztások és egyházközségi önkormányzat* (*Election of parish priests and selfgovernment of church communities*), *Aetas* 1991. 2. p. 26-45, A. Kubinyi, *Egyház és város a késő középkori Magyarországon* (*Church and town in late medieval Hungary*). In: I. Sz. Jónas (ed.): *Társadalomtörténeti tanulmányok a közeli és a régmúltból. Emlékkönyv Székely György 70 születésnapjára*. (*Essays published in honour of Gy. Székely on the occasion of his 70th birthday*). Budapest 1994. p. 74-87, especially p. 75-76.

13. A. Kubinyi, *Op. cit.* p. 75.

14. Confer: D. Kurze, *Op. cit.* p. 436-438; A. Kubinyi, *Op. cit.* p.17.

15. E. Ladányi, *Libera villa, civitas, oppidum. Terminológiai kérdések a magyar városfejlődésben (Questions of terminology in Hungarian urban development)*. *Történelmi Szemle (Historical Review)* 23 (1980) p. 450-477. The article was also published in German: *Annales Universitatis Budapestinensis de Rolando Eötvös nominatae. Sectio Historica*. 20 (1977) p. 3-43. Also confer; A. Kubinyi, *I. Lajos király korában. 1342-1382. (Art in the age of King Louis I. 1342-1382)* p. 29.

16. L. Makkai, *Magyar-román közös múlt (Hungarian-Romanian common past)*. *Hét torony Könyvkiadó*, 1989, p. 52.

17. E. Fügedi, *Op. cit.* p. 403, 525-526; J. Szűcs, *Az utolsó Árpádok*, p. 33-39; KMTL s.v. hospes.

18. J. Szucs, *Op. cit.* p. 208-222; KMTL s.v. polgár, városi jog.

19. A. Kubinyi, *Budai és pesti polgárok családi össyeköttetései a Jagelló-korban (Family connections of the burghers of Buda and Pest in the Jagellonian period) Levperiod) Levéltári Közlemények (Publications of the Hungarian National Archives)* 37 (1966) p. 228-242; KMTL s.v. polgár.

20. Oklevelek Temesvármegye és Temesvárváros történetéhez. Másolta és gyűjtötte Pesty Frigyes. A Magyar Tudományos Akadémia Tört. Bizottsága rendeletéből sajtó alá rendezte Ortvy Tivadar. I. 1183-1430. Pozsony 1896. *Temesvármegye és Temesvárváros története IV.* (Charters to the history of Temes county and the town of Temesvár. Vol. I, 1183-1430. Collected by Frigyes Pesty, edited by Tivadar Ortvy. Further on: Temes). p. 69-71.

21. *Ibidem*, p. 71.

22. *Ibidem*, p. 492-495.

23. *Herceg Batthyány család levéltára Körmenten (Archive of the Batthyány family in Körmed)*. *Miscellanea Heimiana*. No. 172.

24. *Ibidem*, *Országos Levéltár, Diplomatikai Levéltár (Hungarian National Archives, Diplomatic Archives)* 53 063; Temes, p. 439; Lukács Pál: *A XV. századi pápák oklevelei (Papal charters from the 15th century)*. II, Budapest 1938, No. 929.

25. Gy. Kristó, *Szeged története I. A kezdetektől 1986-ig. (The history of the town of Szeged, vol. I. From the beginnings up to 1686)* Szeged 1983. The relevant parts were written by L. Szegő, I. Petrovics and P. Kulcsár.

26. J. Reizner, *Szeged története (The history of the town of Szeged)*, IV, Szeged 1900, p.3.

27. The decimal list was first published by J. Reizner. J. Reizner, *Szeged története*, op. cit. p. 97-128. Reizner's edition was revised by S. Bálint, *Az 1522. évi tizeddlajstrom szegedi vezetéknevei (The surnames of the decimal list of Szeged from the year 1522)*. *A Magyar Nyelvtudomány Kiadványai 105. (Proceedings of the Hungarian Linguistic Society, No.105)* Budapest 1963. Also confer: P. Kulcsár, *Az 1522-es tizedjegizék mint történeti forrás (The decimal list of Szeged from the year 1522 as a historical source)*. *Tanulmányok Csongrád megye történetéből (Essays concerning the history of Csongrád county)*, VIII, Szeged 1984, p.5-27.

28. K. Juhász, *A csanád püspökség (The history of the bishopric of Csanád)* IV, Makó 1947. p.115

29. For this problem see: I. Petrovics, *Was there an ethnic background to the veneration of St. Eligius in Hungary?* In: L. LÖB - I. Petrovics; - Gy. E. Szőnyi (eds) *Froms of identity. Definitions and changes*. Attila József University, Szeged 1994, p.77-87.

30. I. Petrovics, *Royal residences and urban development during the reign of the Anjou kings in Hungary. Forthcoming*.

31. G. wenzel, *Magyar diplomáciai emlékek az Anjou-korból. Acta extrera Andegvensia*, I, p.257.

32. *Scriptores rerum Hungaricum tempore ucum regunque stirpis Arpadianae gestarum. Edendo operi praefiut* E. Szentpétery. I, Budapestini 1937, p.491. The revelant part is from the

Illuminated Chronicle (Chronicon Pictum). Also confer: Johannes de Thurocz *CHRONICA HUNGARUM. II. COMMENTARII. 2*. Ab anno 1301 usque ad annum 1487, Comosuit E. MÁLYUSZ, adiuvante J.Kristó, Budapest, 1988, p.58.

33. D. Huszti, *Olasz-magyar kereskedelmi kapcsolatok a középkorban (Italian-Hungarian trading contacts in the Middle Ages)*, Budapest, 1941.

34. E. Mályusz, *Zsigmond király uralma Magágon (King Sigismund's reign in Hungary)*, Budapest, 1984, p.158-168.

35. I. Draskóczy: *Életpályák a magyar pénzügyigazgatásban a XV. század első felében (Careers in hungarian financial administratio in the first half of the 15th century)*. Thesis for a candidate's degree. Manuscript, Budapest, 1994.

36. P. Engel, *Ozorai Pipó*. In: F. Vadas (ed.): *Ozorai Pipó emlékezete*. Szekszárd, 1987, p.53-88.

37. I. Hațegan, *Pippo Spano și lupta antiotomană în Banat în primele decenii ale secolului al XV-lea*. In: Stlom C II, 1977, p.389-401; Idem, *Banatul și începuturile luptei antiotomane (1389-1426)*. Rolul lui Filippo Scolari, *Revista de Istorie*, 31, 1987; Idem, *Das mittelalterliche Schloss von Temesvár und die von Filippo Scolari im banat gebauten oder renovierten Schlösser*. In: J. Cabello (ed.): *Várak a későközépkorban (Castles in the Late Middle Ages)*. *Castrum Bene*, 2/1990, Budapest, p.268-275.

38. F. Szakály, *Phases of Turco-Hungarian warfare before the battle of Mohács (1365-1526)*. *Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae*, 33, 1979, p.72-85; P. Engel, *Magyarország és a török veszély Zsigmond korában (Hungary and the Ottoman menace under the reign of King Sigismund)*, 1387-1437, *Századok (Centuries)* 128 (1994), p.273-283.

39. E. Mályusz, *a négy Tallóci fivér (The four Tallóci brothers)*, *Történelmi Szemle (Historical Review)* 23, 1980, 4, p.531-576, esp. p.542.

40. Ibidem, p. 542-543.

41. Ibidem, also confer P. Engel, *Magyarország és a török veszély Zsigmund korában*, op. cit., p.283-284, and P. Engel, *Király és arisztokrácia viszonya a Zsigmund-lorában (Relationship of royal power to aristocracy under the reign of King Sigismund)*, 1387-1437, *Értekezésék a történelmi tudományok köréből, Új sorozat*, 83. Budapest, 1977, p.78-81.

42. Zs. Jakó: *A kolozsmonostori konvent jegyzőkönyvei (The minutes of the convent of Kolozsmonostor)*, 1289-1556. I, Budapest, No.277; also confer I. Draskóczy, *Életpályák a magyar pénzügyigazgatásban a XV. század első felében*, op. cit., p.100-101.

43. *Ragusa* (today: Dubrovnik, Croatia) was one of the most flourishing commercial towns of the Adriatic coast. See, for instance B. Krekić, *Dubrovnik in the 14th and 15th centuries: a city between East and West. (Volume 30 in the Centers of Civilisation Series)* Norman 1972, University of Oklahoma Press.

44. I. Petrovics, *Temesvár és Nagyszeben. Megjegyzések egy oklevéltöredék kapcsán. (Temesvár and Nagyszeben. Comments on fragments of a charter)* In: L. Koszta (ed.) *Kelet és Nyugat között. Történelmi tanulmányok Kristó Gyula tiszteletére (Between East and West. Historical studies published in honour of GY. KRISTÓ)*. Szeged, 1995, P.401-413.

46. *Temes*, p.195. Also confer I. Petrovics: *Egy 14. századi temesvári bíró: Postós Mihály (A 14th century mayor of Temesvár: Michael Posztós)*. *Acta Universitatis Szegediensis de Attila József nominatae. Acta Historica*, CIII, Szeged, 1996, p.91-99.

46. Documentary evidences for the appearance of the Romanians in this region are collected, for instance, in: *Documenta historiam Valachorum in hungaria illustrantia usque ad annum 1400 p. Christum*. Curante E. Lukinich et adiuvante L. Gáldi ediderunt A. Fekete Nagy et L. Makkai, Budapest, 1941. *Études sur l'Europe Centre-Orientale*, 29, (further on: *Doc. Val.*). The relevant charter is published in *extenso* in *Temes*, p.87-89, wile an abridged version can be read in *Doc. val.* p.141-142. Also confer: L. Makkai - A. Mócsy (eds.), *Erdély története, I. A kezdetektől, 1606-ig. (A History of Transylvania. Vol. I. From the beginnengs up to 1606)*, Budapest, 1986, p.341-342

47. *Doc. Val.*, p.199-200. The charter is published *in extenso* in F. Zimmermann - C. Werner - G. Müller, *Ukundenbuch zur Geschichte der Deutschen in Siebenbürgen*, II, Hermannstadt 1897, p.256-259. Confer L. Makkai, *Magyar-román közös múlt*, op. cit., p.60

48. *Doc Val.*, p.247.

49. *Temes*, p.185-188, 195-198, 318-323. Also confer I. Petrovics, *Egy 14. századi temesvári bíró: Poszots Mihály*, op. cit.

50. L. Makkai, *Magyar-román közös múlt*, op. cit., p.62-68; R. Popa, *La începuturile evului mediu Românesc. Țara Hațegului (The beginnings of the Romanian Middle Ages)*, București, 1988; *KMTL* s.v. Hátszeg

51. L. Makkai, *Magyar-román közös múlt*, op.cit., p.63-64; *Temes*, p.319.

52. Confer P. Engel : *A temesvári és moldovai szandzsák törökkori települései (The settlements of the sanjaks of Temesvár and Moldova under the Ottoman rule 1554-1579)*, Szeged, 1996, p.5-18. For the Serbs see F. Szakály, *Serbische Einwanderung nach Ungarn in der türkenzeit*. In: *Ethnicity and Society in Hungary*. E.. by. F. Glatz. (*Etudes historiques hongroises* 1990), 2, Budapest, 1990, p.21-29.

53. See the place-names of the data bank (Lexikon) in P. Engel, *A temesvári és moldovai szandzsák törökkori települései*, op. cit., p.21-153.