

# PAPAL POWER, LOCAL COMMUNITIES AND PRETENDERS: THE CHURCH OF CROATIA, DALMATIA AND SLAVONIA AND THE STRUGGLE FOR THE THRONE OF THE KINGDOM OF HUNGARY-CROATIA (1290–1301)

Mišo Petrović\*

*Keywords:* Charles Robert, Šubići, Angevins, Boniface VIII, diocese of Šibenik

*Cuvinte cheie:* Carol Robert, Šubići, Angevinii, Bonifaciu al VIII-lea, dioceza din Šibenik

King Ladislas of Hungary died in 1290 and the country was plunged into a twenty year succession crisis perpetuated by strong oligarchs who supported various pretenders. Andrew III the Venetian (r.1290–1301) received backing by the Hungarian prelates and was crowned king, while the pope favored the Angevins of Naples, primarily Mary of Hungary and her descendants, son Charles Martel (1271–1295) and grandson Charles Robert (1288–1342). Following Andrew's death, most of the oligarchs supported Wenceslas III of Bohemia (1289–1306) and Otto III of Bavaria (1261–1312) before finally recognizing Charles Robert's claim with coronations in 1309 and 1310.

The arrival of Charles Robert to the throne of Hungary and the role played by the Apostolic See was in the focus of a number of works, from fourteenth century chronicles<sup>1</sup> to modern day national historiographies.<sup>2</sup> Here I would like

\* Department of Medieval Studies, Central European University in Budapest, e-mail: Petrovic\_Miso@phd.ceu.ed.

<sup>1</sup> *Chronicon pictum*, the fourteenth-century illuminated chronicle described that Charles Robert gained the throne with the help of the pope from Rome. *Képes Krónika*, ed. Tarján Tamás and Geréb László (Budapest: Magyar Hirlap – Maecenas Kiado, 1993), 112.

<sup>2</sup> A brief list of most recent works which should be consulted for further bibliography and which also reveal that the interest in the question of the arrival of Charles Robert to the throne of Hungary was present in all the modern national historiographies: Blanka Brezováková, "Politický zápas Anjouovcov o uhorskú korunu" [Anjous' Political Struggle for the Hungarian Crown], *Historický časopis* 39 (1991), 569–587; Zoltán Kosztolnyik, "Did the Curia Intervene in the Struggle for the Hungarian Throne during the 1290s?," in *Régi és új peregrináció: Magyarok*

to contextualize the available sources depicting local events within a broader international context. The aim is to understand the developments and the motivations of the participants involved and to understand these developments on a wider scale.

A different set of questions will be asked which would allow us to fully contextualize the role of the Apostolic See during the period of 1290–1301.<sup>3</sup> I will concentrate on the changes in the relationship between papal power, local communities and pretenders and connect these changes with the succession crisis. How did the popes use the succession crisis to intervene and take over the election of prelates from the local communities?<sup>4</sup> How did the Angevins, particularly Mary, use their contacts with Rome to obtain support from the Šubići? How did the Šubići profit from the Church reform in their lands?<sup>5</sup> The focus of the research will be on the southern dioceses, namely on the prelates of Croatia, Dalmatia and Slavonia, but other parts of Hungary will be included depending on the context.

### *The Apostolic See and the Elections*

The normal procedure for appointing a prelate, even the metropolitan-prelate, in the thirteenth century was election by the cathedral chapter,

---

*külföldön, külföldiek Magyarországon*, vol 1, ed. Imre Békési (Budapest-Szeged: Nemzetközi Hungarológiai Kongresszuson, 1993); Serđo Dokoza, “Papinska diplomacija i dolazak anđuvinske dinastije na hrvatsko-ugarsko prijestolje” [Papal diplomacy and the arrival of the Angevin dynasty on Croatian-Hungarian Throne], in *Hrvatska srednjovjekovna diplomacija* [Croatian Medieval Diplomacy], ed. Mladen Andrić and Mirko Valentić (Zagreb: Diplomatska akademija Ministarstva vanjskih poslova Republike Hrvatske, 1999); Andreas Kieseewetter, “L'intervento di Niccolò, Celestino V e Bonifacio VIII nella lotta per il trono ungherese (1290–1303),” in *Bonifacio VIII. Ideologia e azione politica*, ed. Ilaria Bonincontri (Rome: Istituto storico italiano, 2006), 162–5; Robert-Marius Mihalache, “The Holy See's Intervention in the Struggle for the Occupation of the Hungarian Throne (1290–1310),” *Transylvanian Review* XX, Supplement 2/1 (2011): 155–164; Wojciech Kozłowski, *The Thirteenth-Century 'International' System and the Origins of the Angevin-Piast Dynastic Alliance*, Ph.D. dissertation (Budapest: Central European University, 2014).

<sup>3</sup> While this paper is primarily concerned with the years between 1290 and 1301, these questions will also be applied to the following decades as well, in order to observe the effects these developments had.

<sup>4</sup> The process was noted but not fully researched by Serđo Dokoza, “Kronološki pregled povijesti Zadarske nadbiskupije do početka 14. stoljeća” [Chronological overview of the history of the Archdiocese of Zadar until the Fourteenth century], in *Sedamnaest stoljeća zadarske Crkve: Zbornik radova sa znanstvenog skupa o 1700. obljetnici mučeništva sv. Stošije (Anastazije)*, ed. Livio Marijan (Zadar: Sveučilište u Zadru, 2004), 205–206.

<sup>5</sup> Damir Karbić has conducted considerable work on the period of the Šubići. He wrote his PhD and a number of articles on the topic of Šubići, which will be used throughout this paper.

confirmation and consecration by the spiritual superior and, in case of the metropolitan, by receiving the *pallium*.<sup>6</sup> From 1257 the papacy claimed that all disputed elections were *causa major*, to be judged solely by the popes, which led to the gradual papal appropriation of the appointment of the prelates.<sup>7</sup>

The archbishops of Split and Zadar were metropolitan-prelates, which means that they were inspecting, confirming and consecrating the prelates subordinated to them. But their positions were not identical. The archbishop of Split was subordinated directly to the Apostolic See and the papacy demanded that all prelates subordinated to the pope to go to Rome for confirmation and consecration.<sup>8</sup> Zadar, on the other hand, was subordinated to the patriarch of Grado who claimed the title of *primas* of Dalmatia,<sup>9</sup> an honorary title that gave the patriarch the right to confirm and consecrate the archbishop of Zadar.<sup>10</sup>

Croatia and Dalmatia were not unified under a single ruler. The archdiocese of Split and its suffragans<sup>11</sup> accepted the rule of the Hungarian kings, with the archbishop of Split having no superior but the pope, while Zadar and its suffragans<sup>12</sup> were for centuries, with short interruptions, under the Venetians (1116–1358). First, it is necessary to analyze papal interference in Church

<sup>6</sup> The rights of the cathedral chapter were especially promoted during the pontificate of Innocent III (1198–1216). On the gradual development, see: Jörg Peltzer, *Canon Law, Careers and Conquest: Episcopal Elections in Normandy and Greater Anjou, c. 1140–c.1230* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009), 29–53; On *pallium* see: Steven Schoenig, *The Papacy and the Use and Understanding of the Pallium from the Carolingians to the Early Twelfth Century*, Ph.D. dissertation (New York: Columbia University, 2009).

<sup>7</sup> Geoffrey Barraclough, “The Making of a Bishop in the Middle Ages: The Part of the Pope in Law and fact,” *The Catholic Historical Review* 19/3 (1933): 285–7; Robert Benson, *The Bishop-Elect: A Study in Medieval Ecclesiastical Office* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1968): 185, 199; Katherine Harvey, *Episcopal Appointments in England, c. 1214–1344: From Episcopal Election to Papal Provision* (Surrey: Ashgate, 2014), 46–47.

<sup>8</sup> This was not always the case, as elected prelates could ask the pope for dispensation to be consecrated by other bishops, normally suffragans, and not to travel to Rome. This was the case with Archbishop Peter of Split (1297–1324). The pope allowed him to be consecrated by the bishop of Naples, then by any available bishop, and then he ordered Split’s suffragan-bishops of Trogir and Hvar to do the consecration. Tadija Smičiklas, Marko Kostrenčić, Emilij Laszowski, ed. *Codex diplomaticus regni Croatiae, Dalmatiae et Slavoniae: Diplomatički zbornik Kraljevine Hrvatske, Dalmacije i Slavonije*, vol. VII. (Zagreb: JAZU, 1909), 281, May 21, 1297; 305–306, May 18, 1298; 506, May 18, 1298 (further: CDC); Also, see: Harvey, *Episcopal Appointments*, 45–46.

<sup>9</sup> The patriarch of Grado claimed the title during the twelfth century and maintained it until 1451. Joan Dusa, *The Medieval Dalmatian Episcopal Cities: Development and Transformation* (New York: Peter Lang, 1991), 59–62.

<sup>10</sup> Since the Third Lateran Council (1179) *primas* was able to confirm and consecrate his suffragan-archbishops. On the development see: Benson, *The Bishop-Elect*, 8, 168–169, 182–183.

<sup>11</sup> Duvno, Hvar, Knin, Krk, Makarska, Nin, Senj, Škradin, Šibenik and Trogir.

<sup>12</sup> Krk, Rab and Osor.

politics, namely the appointments of the prelates during the period of 1290–1301 and position the cases of Split, Zadar and their suffragans within these developments.

In 1287 Archbishop Lawrence Periander (r.1245) died in Venetian Zadar and the cathedral chapter gathered to elect his successor.<sup>13</sup> The chapter *conven-erunt in unum* and elected Andrew Capsoni, a canon from Padova. Although Padova was a suffragan of Aquileia, with whom Grado was competing for ecclesiastical supremacy<sup>14</sup>, Andrew was also a citizen of Venice, so his election should have been favorable to Venetian authorities. But the patriarch of Grado complained to the pope<sup>15</sup> because Andrew did not seek his confirmation. Pope Nicholas IV (1288–1292), the first Franciscan friar ever elected as pope, reacted by sending Cardinal-priest John Cholet of Santa Cecilia as legate to investigate. Andrew eventually withdrew his bid; instead of allowing the chapter to elect a new prelate, the pope claimed the diocese (*ad provisionem ipsius ecclesiae*) and appointed John de Anagni (1297–1297), also a Franciscan friar. Federico Bianchi claimed that John was a close friend of Pope Nicholas IV and that John followed Nicholas on his travels through Dalmatia.<sup>16</sup>

Pope Boniface VIII (1294–1303) eventually transferred John to Trani. The pope alone could transfer prelates between dioceses, which also gave him the opportunity to immediately appoint the successor. The pope also had the right to appoint the successor of a prelate who died in Rome. These two papal prerogatives were considerably expanded at the end of the thirteenth century and they allowed the pope to slowly appropriate control of the appointments of prelates.<sup>17</sup>

Until recently, John's transfer has often been quoted in Croatian

<sup>13</sup> The papal charter depicting the subsequent events was published in: CDC VII, 19–20, February 10, 1291.

<sup>14</sup> On the background of the conflict see: Thomas Madden, *Enrico Dandolo and the Rise of Venice* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University, 2007), 24.

<sup>15</sup> There were two patriarchs during the period between 1287 and 1291: Guido (1279–1289) and his successor Lorenzo di Parma (1289–1295). It was probably Lorenzo who complained since the pope reacted only in late 1290 or early 1291.

<sup>16</sup> Carlo Federico Bianchi, *Zara cristiana, dell'arcidiacono capitolare* (Zadar: Tipografia Woditzka, 1877), 44. Nicholas also used to be the provincial of the Franciscans in Dalmatia and Istria, appointed in 1272, but he stopped with this function when he was elected in 1274 as the minister general of the Order of Friars Minor. Therefore, it is questionable how much this experience of two years helped him to be acquainted with the ecclesiastical and political situation in Croatia-Dalmatia during his pontificate almost 15 years later. Daniele Farlati, *Trogirski biskupi* [Bishops of Trogir] (Split: Književni krug, 2010), 210.

<sup>17</sup> The right to translate prelates was formulated during the pontificate of Innocent III. Kenneth Pennington, *Pope and Bishops. The Papal Monarchy in the Twelfth and Thirteenth Centuries* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania, 1984), 85–100.

historiography as proof that the papacy intervened in the Church politics of Dalmatia-Croatia with the aim of bringing the Angevins to the throne.<sup>18</sup> It was common for the pope to transfer prelates within the borders of a single realm as Zadar was not part of the Kingdom of Hungary-Croatia but of the Republic of Venice, and Trani was a Venetian-dominated port within the Kingdom of Naples and the Venetians' main contact for trade there.<sup>19</sup>

Following John's transfer the pope appointed Henry de Tuderto (1297–99)<sup>20</sup>, who died at the Roman Curia in 1299; the pope then appointed James de Fuligno (1299–1312).<sup>21</sup> That fact that in 1312 the cathedral chapter elected Alexander (1312–14)<sup>22</sup>, while Pope Clement V (1305–1314) rejected Alexander and appointed Nicholas de Setia in 1312, further corroborates this new approach of the papacy.<sup>23</sup> Both Alexander and Nicholas were Dominican friars, so it seems that, in this case, membership in an order did not play a role in the appointment. In fact, the first local person who would be accepted by the papacy was John Butuan in 1322, although he was probably acceptable because he had a prior good relationship with the Curia.<sup>24</sup> For over 30 years the papacy

<sup>18</sup> Quite recently in Dokoza, "Papinska diplomacija," 274, who quoted an older work by Šandor Szentgyörgy, *Borba Anžuvina za prijestolje ugarsko-hrvatsko do prve krunidbe Karla Roberta* [The Angevin struggle for the throne of Hungary-Croatia until the first coronation of Charles Robert] (Zagreb: C. Albrechta, 1893), 30.

<sup>19</sup> The court in Naples put great effort into keeping the competing Florentines and Venetians apart. Venetians were situated in Trani, Florentines in Barletta. They clashed in Manfredonia and Brindisi. David Abulafia, "Venice and the Kingdom of Naples in the Last Years of Robert the Wise 1332–1343," *Papers of the British School at Rome* 48 (1980): 194. It was also common for priests in the Republic of Venice to be promoted or translated within the dioceses under the domination of Venice, although in this period this was not as well established as later in the fifteenth century.

<sup>20</sup> CDC VII, 283–284, June 18, 1297.

<sup>21</sup> CDC VII, 343–344, June 15, 1299.

<sup>22</sup> Damir Karbić placed the election and rejection of Alexander in the context of papal-Venetian conflicts over Ferrara, the rebellion of Zadar against Venice and the takeover of the city by the Šubići. The Šubići and Alexander had certain contacts and it could be that the Šubići influenced the Zadar's cathedral chapter to elect Alexander. Yet the papal rejection of Alexander follows the pattern established previously by the Curia. The pope rejected the election of the cathedral chapter, claimed that the right to appoint was in papal hands (*ad provisionem ipsius ecclesie Iadrensis*) and provided Zadar with a new prelate. The popes did this regularly in the period from 1291 to 1322. Damir Karbić, "Crkvena politika Šubića Bribirskih do sloma Kliške grane u 1356." [Ecclesiastical Policy of the Šubići of Bribir until the Fall of the Branch of the Counts of Klis (1356)], in *Humanitas et litterae. Zbornik u čast Franje Šanjeka*, ed. Lovorka Čoralić and Slavko Slišković (Zagreb: Dominikanska naklada Istina; Kršćanska sadašnjost, 2009), 143–145.

<sup>23</sup> CDC VIII, 316–7, July 31, 1312.

<sup>24</sup> During Legate Gentile mission in Hungary-Croatia (1308–11) John sided with Gentile in legate's conflict with the clergy of Zadar.

appointed and consecrated the prelates in Rome<sup>25</sup>, excluding Grado from the process despite his official primacy over Zadar. The patriarch would only appear again in consecrating John in 1322.<sup>26</sup> In fact, the nature of the ecclesiastical relationship between Grado and Zadar, and its political implications for Venice, remain unexplored. I am unfamiliar with any dissonant tones coming from the patriarch of Grado because he was left out of the confirmation and consecration of the archbishop of Zadar. Also, during the period in question the patriarch of Grado was still performing canonical visitation of churches and monasteries of Zadar.<sup>27</sup>

Disputed elections within a bishopric were settled by the metropolitan; however, the popes slowly claimed the right to settle disputed elections themselves. In fact, there was no need to have two or more candidates for a position, as it was enough to have a formal complaint for the pope to become involved.<sup>28</sup>

Due to the lack of sources it is not always easy to assess the developments in smaller dioceses<sup>29</sup>, but it seems that the cases for Zadar's suffragans were similar to Zadar. In 1290 the cathedral chapter in Krk could not decide between John of Krk, a Franciscan friar, and Zacharia, a Dominican friar. Pope Nicholas IV, a Franciscan himself, rejected both and instead appointed Lambert (1290–1299), who was a Franciscan friar himself. Lambert was most likely appointed due to his close connections with Pope Nicholas, but this link remained and got stronger even under Boniface VIII.<sup>30</sup> In fact, Pope Boniface would also appoint the next two bishops of Krk from the ranks of the Franciscans, although it is worth noting that here the pope fully used the two recently established rights of the papacy: the right of papal appointment after the transfer of the prelate and after the prelate's death in Rome.<sup>31</sup> The popes also appointed the Franciscans

<sup>25</sup> Nicholas IV and Clement V consecrated John de Anagni (1291) and Nicholas of Setia (1312), while Boniface VIII left the consecration of Henry de Todi (1297) and James de Fuligno (1299) to the bishop of Porto and Santa-Rufina. Bianchi, *Zara cristiana*, 45–46.

<sup>26</sup> Bianchi, *Zara cristiana*, 47.

<sup>27</sup> Visitation meant that the Church superior was evaluating the ecclesiastical institutions under his care. For example, in 1306 Patriarch Egidio visited monasteries in Zadar. CDC VIII, 125–129.

<sup>28</sup> Barraclough, "The Making," 293–294, 297.

<sup>29</sup> For instance in Rab where it seems that the elections were settled on the local level. Daniele Farlati, *Illyricum Sacrum*, vol. V. (Venice: Apud Sebastianum Coleti, 1751), 234–4. (further IS)

<sup>30</sup> There are several papal charters providing Lambert with privileges from the papacy, and in 1296 Boniface appointed Lambert as papal vicar in Rome. CDC VII, 2–3, 78, 218.

<sup>31</sup> CDC VI, 691–2, March 8, 1290; Following Lambert's transfer in 1299 Boniface appointed as his successor Mathew, and after Mathew's death in Rome, the pope again appointed successor, Thomas. Conrad Eubel, ed., *Hierarchia Catholica Medii Aevi sive summorum pontificum*, vol. 1 (Munster, 1913), 518 (further: HC); CDC VIII, 31–2, August 13, 1302.



in Osor. In 1290 Nicholas IV appointed Michael<sup>32</sup>, a friar and the main inquisitor in Dalmatia, while in 1295 Archbishop John of Zadar rejected the choice of the cathedral chapter of Osor, canon Thomas, who was deemed unworthy. This was all normal procedure as the metropolitan was the one who confirmed and consecrated his suffragan bishops. Pope Boniface VIII got involved and tasked Archbishop John to appoint somebody from the Franciscan order as the new bishop of Osor. John appointed friar Angelus (1295–1315).<sup>33</sup> These cases provide good examples of the papacy's new approach. The popes mediated in disputed elections, even if they were supposed to be mediated by the metropolitan-prelate, and promoted papal candidates or members of the Franciscan Order. Further, it seems that the popes kept a close eye on the dioceses in which it was involved and utilized subsequent elections to expand their prerogatives.

From these examples we can see a combination of several elements: complaints to the papacy regarding problems in the election, papal interference in some of the problematic elections and also use of newly formed right to appoint successors to the prelates who died at the Curia. In all the above mentioned cases there were no examples where the pope previously made a reservation – while in some cases the pope ordered the archbishop to find a suitable candidate, in most he simply appointed a prelate. The Curia began to appropriate the appointments of prelates even before its further development during the pontificate of Pope John XXII (1316–1334).<sup>34</sup> The result was the same: the papacy appropriated the appointments of prelates, and members of the mendicant orders were favoured, especially Franciscans during the pontificate of Nicholas IV and Boniface VIII. Never before had the papacy intervened on this scale in the election of the prelates, especially in favour of the mendicants.<sup>35</sup>

Franciscans were viewed as ideal mediators in local disputes. Both popes, Nicholas IV and Boniface VIII, had close links with the Franciscans. Nicholas

<sup>32</sup> IS V, 197. It seems there was probably another bishop between Michael and Angelus by the name of James (Jacobus) who died in 1295, but nothing more is known about him.

<sup>33</sup> *Mandatur provisio ecclesie Absaren*, it seems that Thomas did not know Latin adequately. CDC VII, 209–10, October 2, 1295; Jadranka Neralić, *Priručnik za istraživanje hrvatske povijesti u tajnom vatikanskom arhivu od ranog srednjeg vijeka do sredine XVIII. stoljeca (Schedario Garampi)* [Manual for researching Croatian history in Vatican secret archives], vol. 1 (Zagreb: Hrvatski institute za povijest, 2000), 96, no. 46.

<sup>34</sup> See the development in: Jadranka Neralić, *Put do crkvene nadarbine: Rimska Kurija i Dalmacija u 15. stoljeću* (A way to the ecclesiastical carrier: The Roman Curia and 15<sup>th</sup>-century Dalmatia) (Split: Književni krug, 2007), 146–148.

<sup>35</sup> Only in Trogir were some bishops Franciscan friars, but they were elected. See: HC, 490; Willliell Thomson, *Friars in the cathedral: the first Franciscan bishops 1226–1261* (Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Medieval Studies, 1975), 129–136.

was the minister general of the Order (1274–1279), and the first friar to become pope, while Boniface was one of the members of the commission to provide an authoritative commentary on the Franciscan Order's Rule.<sup>36</sup> During the 1280s and 1290s there was an increase in consecration of Franciscans as bishops across Christendom: Michael Robson identified 23 in 1280s and 36 in 1290s.<sup>37</sup> This favoritism by the papacy towards the mendicants should be further researched, for the appointments came in a period of conflict over episcopal autonomy. The papacy was expanding its privileges, and the claims of the Franciscan and Dominicans masters that prelates derived their jurisdiction from the papacy and had no right to resist the papal privileges suited this endeavor well.<sup>38</sup>

Following the peace treaty between Zadar and Venice in 1247, the Venetians demanded that the count and archbishop of Zadar always be elected from Venice and that the archbishop be confirmed and consecrated by the patriarch in Grado.<sup>39</sup> It is hard to conclude why Venice allowed papal involvement in the appointment of prelates on the territories under Venetian rule. The most likely reason is a combination of common respect for papal authority and the Venetian tendency not to fully enforce their rights regarding the Church in Zadar in this period. The Venetians would fully enforce their right to appoint the Venetian prelates only after 1420. The situation with Split was a bit different, since it and its suffragans were part of the Kingdom of Hungary-Croatia. Interferences into the appointments there could have been seen as the infringement on the territory of the kings of Hungary, although the ability of the king to affect cathedral chapter elections depended on the strength of the particular king.<sup>40</sup>

Next I will concentrate on the appointment of the archbishop of Split in 1297 and the establishment of the diocese of Šibenik in the following year, although the situation with suffragans will also be reviewed. While with the examples from Zadar and its suffragans I have shown how the papacy appropriated the appointments of the prelates, the situation with Split and Šibenik shows how much political motives dictated papal attitudes toward filling a

<sup>36</sup> Michael Robson, *The Franciscans in the Middle Ages* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2006), 98.

<sup>37</sup> Robson, *The Franciscans*, 106.

<sup>38</sup> Brian Tierney, *Foundation of the Conciliar Theory: The Contribution of the Medieval Canonist from Gratian to the Great Schism* (Leiden: Brill, 1998), XVI.

<sup>39</sup> Treaty is published in: Šime Ljubić, *Listine o odnošajih između južnoga Slavenstva i Mletačke Republike* [Charters about relationship between South Slavs and the Venetian Republic], vol. I (Zagreb: JAZU, 1868): 69. For background on the conflicts see: Ferdo Šišić, "Zadar i Venecija od godine 1159. do 1247," [Zadar and Venice from 1159 to 1247], *Rad JAZU* 142 (1900): 264–74.

<sup>40</sup> It seems that during the thirteenth century there were several instances of popes and Hungarian kings conflicting over the appointment of the archbishop of Split. See: Judit Gal, "The Roles and Loyalties of the Bishops and Archbishops of Dalmatia (1102–1301)," *Hungarian Historical Review* 3 (2014): 476–477.



vacant diocese and how legal and political consideration were involved.<sup>41</sup> The questions surrounding Split and Šibenik reveal how much the political situation in the Kingdom of Hungary-Croatia was connected with the links created between the popes, the Angevin rulers of Naples and the local oligarchs.

### *The Popes, the Angevins, the Oligarchs*

Immediately following the death of King Ladislas IV, his sister Queen Mary of Naples claimed the throne of Hungary for herself<sup>42</sup>, but the Angevins were met with difficulties along the way. In Hungary Andrew III claimed the throne and maintained it mostly through the support of the Hungarian clergy, on whom the king bestowed important positions and donations in Hungary.<sup>43</sup> Meanwhile, Naples was still embroiled in the protracted war with Sicily and Aragon. Charles II spent several years (1284–1288) imprisoned by Peter III of Aragon, during which time Naples was managed by two regents, Robert of Artois and Legate Gerard.<sup>44</sup> It is worth noting that Gerard was the same person sent to Split in 1297 and was therefore intimately familiar with the dealings of the Neapolitan court.

The imprisonment and war with Sicily offered Charles's wife, Mary, and their firstborn, Charles Martel, a bigger role in the kingdom. Mary issued charters referring to herself as *filia Regis Ungariae* and vicar regent of Sicily. Mary was also very active in diplomatic activities with other countries, particularly with King Edward of England who addressed his letters directly to Mary rather than to the regents. It is particularly interesting that Edward supported the Angevin claim on Hungary from the start.<sup>45</sup> As designated heir, Charles Martel led the Angevin armies and, after 1289, acted as regent.<sup>46</sup> In June 1291

<sup>41</sup> Geoffrey Barraclough stated that the popes had deep political interest in any important election. Barraclough, "The Making," 183–184.

<sup>42</sup> She was sister Ladislas's sister.

<sup>43</sup> The prelates in Hungary directly benefitted from the reign of King Andrew as he rewarded them with donations of lands and influential positions as chancellors and vice-chancellors at the royal court. Such donations were also evident in Zagreb, but they completely lacked for the Church in Croatia and Dalmatia. Kiesewetter, "L'intervento," 157–159.

<sup>44</sup> Gerard was one in a line of legates that popes would nominate to uphold their suzerain rights in Naples, which the popes considered as their fief granted to the secular rulers. Jean Dunbabin, *The French in the Kingdom of Sicily 1266–1305* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011), 103–4.

<sup>45</sup> Attila Bárány, "The English Relations of Charles II of Sicily and Maria of Hungary," in *Le Diplomatie des Etats Angevins aux XIIIe et XIVe Siecles*, ed. István Petrovics and Zoltán Kordé (Rome: Accademia d'Ungheria in Roma, 2010), 76–77.

<sup>46</sup> Mario Gaglione, *Converrà ti que aptengas la flor: Profili di sovrani angioini, da Carlo I a Renato (1266–1442)* (Milano: Lampi di stampa, 2009), 123.

Mary was named vicar of Provence, Forcalquier and Avignon.<sup>47</sup> Charles thus entrusted the safekeeping of his core provinces to two of the people closest to him. In 1292 Mary transferred her rights to Hungary to Charles Martel<sup>48</sup>, who in April attempted to obtain recognition from the councils of the Dalmatian cities.<sup>49</sup> After some initial setbacks, Martel attempted to gather an army in 1294 to invade Hungary through Northern Italy<sup>50</sup>, but this attempt seems to have failed and further attempts were stalled by Martel's death in September 1295 due to plague.<sup>51</sup> Following Martel's death, Charles II's other three sons were released from the Aragonian captivity in which they had been placed as part of the settlement between Aragon, Sicily and Naples.<sup>52</sup>

The Apostolic See, on the other hand, did not unconditionally support the Angevin claim. Pope Nicholas IV never referred to Mary or Charles Martel in relation to their Hungarian titles, but instead called them *Regina Sicilie* and *Princeps Salernitanus*.<sup>53</sup> Andreas Kiesewetter rightly concluded that the Apostolic See could not intervene against Andrew III, as he was an internationally recognized ruler and any action against him could be isolating.<sup>54</sup> This changed in 1296. By that time Pope Boniface had recognized the Angevin claim<sup>55</sup>, and Charles II had excluded Charles Robert, the eight year old son of Martel, in favour of Robert. Already a grown man, Robert was appointed the duke of Calabria in 13 February, yet it took an entire year (until 24 February 1297) for the pope to recognize the decision by Charles II.<sup>56</sup> While Charles

<sup>47</sup> Matthew Clear, "Mary of Hungary as queen, patron and exemplar," in: *The church of Santa Maria Donna Regina: art, iconography, and patronage in fourteenth century Naples*, ed. Janis Elliott and Cordelia Warr (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2004), 45–46.

<sup>48</sup> CDC VII, 67–8, January 6, 1292.

<sup>49</sup> The councils of Split, Trogir and Šibenik at first delayed their answer and in the end decided that they would accept Charles Martel if he crowned himself in Székesfehérvár. Szentgyörgy, *Borba Anžuvínaca*, 22–23.

<sup>50</sup> Gusztáv Wenzel, ed., *Magyar diplomáciai emlékek az Anjou-korból*, vol. III (Budapest: Magyar Tudományos Akadémia Történelmi Bizottsága, 1876), 115–8.

<sup>51</sup> Vladimír Vasko, "Počiatky vlády Anjouovcov v Uhorsku," *Historia Nova* 6 (2013): 32–33.

<sup>52</sup> In order of birth: Saint Louis of Toulouse, Robert the Wise and Raymond Berengar. Jean Dunbabin, *Captivity and imprisonment in Medieval Europe, 1000–1300* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2002), 85.

<sup>53</sup> Kiesewetter, "L'intervento," 152.

<sup>54</sup> He referred to period of Nicholas IV, but this was also applicable later. Kiesewetter, "L'intervento," 157.; Although, as noted before King Edward of England supported the Angevins to the throne of Hungary.

<sup>55</sup> Although Boniface probably just continued the policy of his predecessor, Celestine V, who crowned Charles Martel in Rome in 1294. Blanka Brezováková, „Politický zápas Anjouovcov o uhorskú korunu," *Historický časopis* 39 (1991): 572.

<sup>56</sup> Louis was next in line after Martel, but he renounced his claim to the throne, probably in

Martel was acting vicar and stood to inherit all of the titles, Charles II then divided the titles very specifically, maintaining the integrity of the core Angevin provinces: the Regno and Provence. Following the division of 1296, Queen Mary played a bigger role regarding the question of the throne of Hungary, maintaining contacts with the oligarchs of Hungary-Croatia. The favourable contact between the Angevins and the Šubići oligarchs became key to church policy. In order to understand their need to rely on one other, it is necessary to shortly outline these contacts.

After 1290 four oligarchical families went to Naples in order to obtain privileges from the Neapolitan court: the Frankapani, the Koszegi, the Babonići and the Šubići. The Koszegi relied upon the Angevins following their initial conflict with Andrew. Yet despite his conflict with Andrew throughout the entire 1290s, and his excommunication by Archbishop Lodomer of Esztergom, one of Andrew's strongest prelate-supporters, John Koszegi only went to Naples in 1292, when he obtained the right of war (*liberum belli ius et ferri licentiam*) against Andrew.<sup>57</sup> The Babonići, on the other hand, were the regular enemy of the Koszegi in the past and had greater contacts with the Angevins. Radoslav Babonić tried to maintain his position by obtaining privileges from both Naples and Andrew III, balancing between the two courts. Radoslav obtained privileges from both courts until 1295 when Andrew's mother, Duchess Tomasina Morosini, took some of Radoslav's forts, citing his infidelity to the king.<sup>58</sup> The Babonići only appeared in Naples in late 1299 when it became clear that Charles Robert would be sent to Hungary, but even then they were still balancing between the Angevins and Andrew III.<sup>59</sup> Count Dujam Frankapan visited

---

January 1296, and the third son of Charles II, Robert, was knighted and proclaimed the duke of Calabria, which was from that time on recognized as the title borne by the eldest son instead of the prince of Salerno, a title which Charles Robert received. Charles Robert was also only named as the heir to the title of the Kingdom of Hungary, and thus eventually denied any rights in Naples. According to Kelly in the eyes of both Pope Boniface VIII and Charles II, Charles Robert was an unacceptable successor since he already inherited the rights to Hungary. See: Margaret Toynbee, *St. Louis of Toulouse and the process of canonisation in the fourteenth century* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1929), 101–102; Samantha Kelly, *The New Solomon, Robert of Naples (1309–1343) and Fourteenth-Century Kingship* (Leiden: Brill, 2003), 8.

<sup>57</sup> Vjekoslav Klaić, *Povijest Hrvata od najstarijih vremena do svršetka XIX stoljeća*, [History of Croats since the oldest times until end of the 19th century], vol. I, ed. Trpimir Macan (Rijeka: Nakladni zavod Matice hrvatske, Tisak "Riječka tiskara," 1972), 268; Archbishop Lodomer excommunicated John Koszegi, but Archbishop Gregory in 1299 revoked the excommunication. See: György Fejér, ed., *Codex diplomaticus Hungariae ecclesiasticus ac civilis*, vol. VI. (Buda: Regiae Vniversitatis Vngaricae 1829), 225–226.

<sup>58</sup> Hrvoje Kekez, *Plemićki rod Babonića do kraja 14. stoljeća* [The kindred Babonići], Ph.D. dissertation (Zagreb: Hrvatski studiji, 2011), 68–77.

<sup>59</sup> Kekez, *Plemićki rod Babonića*, 82–4.

Naples only in 1291 together with Radoslav Babonić.<sup>60</sup> Dujam is mentioned only in 1300 when Charles II informed him about the departure of Charles Robert and promised to confirm all his properties if he came to Naples to escort Charles Robert.<sup>61</sup> It seems that Dujam did not go to Naples. In fact, of all the families, the Šubići were the only ones who maintained regular contacts with Naples due to economic and political ties as well as the proximity of both sides of Adriatic.<sup>62</sup> This was because the Dalmatian cities under the Šubići's rule, the Šubići's representatives, and Count George himself regularly visited Naples and Rome.

Although the Šubići maintained strong economic and diplomatic ties with the Angevins, they only fully backed Charles Robert after Queen Mary helped them in reforming the church organisation on the territories under their rule. This was the reason for the establishment of the diocese of Šibenik, but to accomplish this it was necessary for the Šubići to appoint someone reliable as the archbishop of Split. It is therefore necessary to understand the background of the conflicts over the diocese of Šibenik, which lasted for decades and included the local communities, the oligarchs Šubići and the archbishop of Split.

The Šubići slowly established their rule over most of Dalmatia from the 1260s.<sup>63</sup> The three important members of the Šubići were Paul, who was briefly potestas of Trogir (1272) and count of Split (1273–1277) before becoming ban of Croatia-Dalmatia (after 1275), and his brothers George and Mladen. George was count of Šibenik (1267–1303) and Trogir (1281–1304); Mladen, count of Split (1277–1301).<sup>64</sup> These cities maintained certain degrees of municipal autonomy. Yet it seems that the Šubići's reign was strongest over Šibenik, the city closest to their center of rule in Bribir. Despite their relatively consistent power, they repeatedly encountered problems in Trogir; the citizens' preference toward Italian city magistrates hampered Šubići attempts to assume full control of the city.<sup>65</sup>

<sup>60</sup> CDC VII, 34, June 6, 1291.

<sup>61</sup> CDC VII, 367, February 10, 1300; 386–387, May 8, 1300.

<sup>62</sup> Miroslav Granić, "Jadranska politika Šubića Bribirskih," [The Adriatic politics of the Šubići]. *Radovi Zavoda povijesnih znanosti HAZU u Zadru* 36 (1994): 43–4; Damir Karbić, *The Šubići of Bribir: A Case Study of a Croatian Medieval Kindred*, Ph.D. dissertation, (Budapest: Central European University, 2000), 60.

<sup>63</sup> Already in 1230s the Šubići had obtained some level of control over Dalmatia, but this was shaken during the reign of King Bela IV (1235–1270) who tried to contain the power of the oligarchs. The realm underwent serious problems during the 1260s, which enabled the Šubići to again increase their power in Croatia and Dalmatia. See: Granić, "Jadranska politika," 37–8.

<sup>64</sup> Grga Novak, *Povijest Splita* [The History of Split], vol. 1 (Split: Čakavski sabor, 1978), 178, 180.

<sup>65</sup> Granić, "Jadranska politika," 40.; Damir Karbić, "Odnosi gradskoga plemstva i bribirskih knezova Šubića: Prilog poznavanju međusobnih odnosa hrvatskih velikaša i srednjovjekovnih

In an ecclesiastical sense Šibenik belonged to the diocese of Trogir. The conflicts between Šibenik and Trogir lasted for the entire thirteenth century and mostly revolved around incomes and tithes.<sup>66</sup> Yet from the 1270s the clergy of Šibenik started to demand the establishment of the diocese of Šibenik and election of their own bishop. In 1274 the clergy of Šibenik even elected Bishop Paul (1274–1287) who received confirmation by Archbishop John of Split (1266–1294). At that time Paul and George Šubići were in conflict with Trogir<sup>67</sup>, and the borders of the archbishop of Split almost fully coincided with the Šubići rule.

Following Bishop Paul's death the clergy of Šibenik decided to elect a new bishop, a Venetian citizen by the name Leonard Falieri (1287–98). This time they did not have support and Archbishop John revoked the recognition, claiming that he had been pressured by the secular Šubići authorities.<sup>68</sup> It seems that in 1288 the clergy of Šibenik tried, with the backing of secular supporters, to obtain support for their bishop and separate diocese by claiming control over the cathedral chapter of Morinje.<sup>69</sup> Pope Nicholas IV appointed a three-member-committee to deal with the case, and the committee realized that some documents aimed at helping Šibenik's case were forged.<sup>70</sup> Archdeacon James appears to have been the first to recognize the forgery. Later the bishop of Skradin, Paul Šubići's seat of power, was warned by Archbishop John not to perform his episcopal duties in Šibenik because that was the territory of bishop of Trogir.

From these examples, the following can be concluded. With the establishment of firm control over Šibenik, the Šubići supported the attempts to elect a bishop and establish a separate diocese. They explored different options to

---

dalmatinskih komuna," [Relationship between city nobility and counts Šubići of Berberio], *Povijesni prilozi* 35 (2008): 47–50; and "Uloga bibrirskih knezova u osnutku šibenske biskupije," [The Role of the Counts of Bribir in the establishment of the bishopric of Šibenik], in *Sedam stoljeća šibenske biskupije*, ed. Vilijam Lakić (Šibenik: GK "J.Šižgorić," 2001), 56–57.

<sup>66</sup> For the background see: Karbić, *The Šubići of Bribir*, 335–340.

<sup>67</sup> Granić, "Jadranska politika," 39.

<sup>68</sup> Ivan Lucić, *Povijesna svjedočanstva o Trogiru* [Historical Accounts about Trogir], vol. I (Split: Čakavski sabor, 1979), 202–232, 244–249, 289–90, 307–309. Also, Karbić, *The Šubići of Bribir*, 336–337.

<sup>69</sup> A cathedral chapter which was destroyed by the "Greek heretics". The rights over this chapter were claimed by both the clergy of Trogir and Šibenik in attempts to prove which see was older.

<sup>70</sup> A confirmation that it were the Šubići who were deeply involved into this issue was the fact that Count George warned the bishop of Trogir not to go to Rome to discuss the possibility of the establishment of the new diocese in Šibenik. George also decided to suspend his position of count of Trogir in that year and he threaten Trogir with war. Farlati, *Trogirski biskupi*, 210; Granić, "Jadranska politika," 55–6; Nada Klaić, *Povijest grada Trogira: Javni život grada i njegovih ljudi* [History of Trogir: Public life of the city and its inhabitants] (Trogir: Muzej grada Trogira, 1985), 178.

accomplish this ranging from obtaining the support of the archbishop of Split, forging documents and even having the bishop of Skradin intervene in Šibenik. Yet all these options failed as the Šubići lacked the papal support for their plans, particularly after 1287 when Archbishop John opposed the plans to secede Šibenik from Trogir.

In 1294 Archdeacon James was elected as the archbishop of Split. At this point James already had a career in Split and was familiar to the Roman Curia.<sup>71</sup> Although it cannot be said with certainty that he was against the establishment of a separate diocese in Šibenik, the Šubići could have viewed him as someone who would oppose the new diocese and therefore continue the policy of Archbishop John. In 1297 Pope Boniface VIII did not recognize the choice by the cathedral chapter of Split, stating that it was not done according to the rules, and Archdeacon James was forced to give his resignation to Legate Gerard Bianchi, titular bishop of Sabina. Although it is difficult to say who complained, the most obvious party was the clergy with connections with the Šubići. From the previous examples, and the fact that the same people were involved in the problems surrounding the establishment of the diocese of Šibenik in 1274, 1288 and 1298, we can safely say that the Šubići expected that a friendly archbishop in Split could push for the main goal of the Šubići's politics – the establishment of the diocese in Šibenik. The fact that Count George was twice in Rome (1290 and 1293) suggests that he was trying to obtain the confirmation for Šibenik.<sup>72</sup> On the recommendation of Neapolitan Queen Mary of Hungary, Boniface appointed her chaplain Peter (1297–1324), a Franciscan friar, as the new archbishop.<sup>73</sup> Immediately after Peter's appointment, Šibenik was elevated to the status of bishopric. In 1298 Peter, together with another prelate appointed by Boniface, Archbishop Henry of Zadar, announced in Šibenik the papal decision to elevate that place to the rank of city and diocese. Peter and Henry appointed and consecrated the new bishop Martin, a Franciscan friar.<sup>74</sup>

As has been shown, this success came only with the support of Queen Mary. Her chaplain was appointed archbishop in Split and she persuaded Pope Boniface to grant the Šubići what they wanted – Church reform on the

<sup>71</sup> Ante Gulin, *Hrvatski srednjovjekovni kaptoli: Loca credibilia Dalmacije, Hrvatskog primorja, Kvarnerskih otoka i Istre* [Croatian Medieval Cathedral Chapters of Dalmatia, Croatian Littoral, Kvarner islands and Istria] (Zagreb: HAZU, 2008), 32–33.

<sup>72</sup> Karbić, "Uloga bibrirskih," 59–60.

<sup>73</sup> *quia tamen infra tempus a iure statutum idem archidiaconus non fuit negotium electionis huiusmodi prosecutes, dicta election iuribus, si que habuit, extitit vacuata*," CDC VII, 277–8, May 10, 1297.

<sup>74</sup> CDC VII, 304–5, June 23, 1298. The new diocese was even established before the pope granted Peter pallium. CDC VII, 305–6, May 18, 1298.



territories of their rule.<sup>75</sup> In fact, following the establishment of the new diocese, contact between the Angevins and the Šubići increased. Starting from August 1298 the Šubići were regularly addressed in Naples as *dilectos consanguineos*, the family relatives of the Angevins.<sup>76</sup> In August 1299 Charles II, in the presence of Queen Mary, confirmed the possessions of the Šubići in Croatia and Dalmatia<sup>77</sup>, while in September ships were prepared to carry the queen from Brindisi (or Monopoli) to Split.<sup>78</sup> It seems that Mary was not only waiting for the Šubići to come to Naples to ask for privileges, but she also actively participated in the negotiations. Not long after, in November, the court allowed safe passage for Count George Šubići, who was on his way to Naples to invite Charles Robert to claim the throne.<sup>79</sup> The Angevins obtained the necessary support to send Charles Robert to Hungary, while the Šubići obtained the desired Church reform of their territories.

From the above it is evident what the Angevins and the Šubići sought to gain from this deal, but what the Apostolic See stood to gain remains unclear.

### *Papal Legalism or Papal Opportunism?*

Papal interference in Split and Zadar came in the form of two legates, John Cholet<sup>80</sup> and Gerard Bianchi<sup>81</sup>, sent to Zadar and Split respectively. Belonging to the ranks of the cardinals of the Sacred College, these men were not only the most important papal legates who were often sent on delicate missions, but whose importance as the group increased during the thirteenth century. At the end of the century the Apostolic See introduced the common services (*servitia communia*), an income shared between the cardinals and the popes, which was paid by the newly appointed prelate following the confirmation. Also, in 1289 Pope Nicholas IV gave the cardinals half of the income that the Apostolic See

<sup>75</sup> The Angevins obtain prelatships for at least three more Franciscans in their service. Toynbee, *St. Louis*, 106.

<sup>76</sup> Although, it should be noted that the first use of this term was in 1295, it did not appear again until 1298 after which it was more regular. See: Karbić, *The Šubići of Bribir*, 161–164; and CDC VII, 313, 353, 361–362.

<sup>77</sup> CDC VII, 353–354, August 4, 1299.

<sup>78</sup> CDC VII, 356, September 29, 1299.

<sup>79</sup> CDC VII, 357, November 19, 1299.

<sup>80</sup> He performed important missions to France, even offering, on behalf of the pope, the French king's son the throne of Aragon. Steven Runciman, *The Sicilian Vespers: A History of the Mediterranean World in the Later Thirteenth Century* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992), 243.

<sup>81</sup> Gerard was one in a line of legates that popes would nominate to uphold their suzerain rights in Naples, which the popes considered as their fief granted to the secular rulers. Dunbabin, *The French in the Kingdom of Sicily*, 103–4.; Runciman, *The Sicilian Vespers*, 223–257.

possessed at the time which meant that the cardinals had immediate interest in appointments done by the papacy.<sup>82</sup> From the time of Boniface VIII frequent are sources listing the payments of these services by the Croatian and Dalmatian episcopacy.<sup>83</sup> This demonstrates the gravity the popes placed on elections in these metropolitan sees and the interest that the popes and the cardinals shared in controlling the appointments. Cardinals had by that time become an important factor in papal politics and administration. As seen from the examples of cardinal legates John and Gerard, the papacy was closely examining the episcopal elections in Croatia-Dalmatia.<sup>84</sup>

It is hard to judge the personal behavior of the pope. We can only judge his actions and, from those, speculate about the motivations for his decisions. Despite Boniface's intricate relationship with the Angevins, he still had to consider the interests and position of the Apostolic See. Norman Zacour pointed out that Boniface VIII relied on only a small number of trusted cardinals and often reserved the most important affairs for himself.<sup>85</sup> We can clearly see the personal touch of certain popes: Nicholas IV favoured his brethren Franciscans, Boniface VIII took a more legalistic approach, Benedict XI favoured his brethren Dominicans, and so on. Popes needed a conflict in order to intervene in a particular election, as the disputed elections fell under the jurisdiction of the pope. The lack of sources for some smaller diocese can corroborate this conclusion, as the appointments of prelates therein followed the usual procedures and did not leave any written evidence.

Andreas Kiesewetter argued that the popes did not intervene in any other dioceses than Šibenik and Split, but papal intervention could only happen in the event of a problematic election and consequent complaint to Rome.<sup>86</sup> Here we are also hampered by lack of evidence, since very few sources remain for cases where there were no problems with the election of the prelate.<sup>87</sup> As we have seen in the previous examples of Zadar, Split and their suffragans, the popes at this time

<sup>82</sup> William Lunt, *Papal revenues in the Middle Ages*, vol. 1 (New York: Columbia Press, 1934), 26–7, 81–91.

<sup>83</sup> Josip Barbarić et al, eds, *Monumenta Croatica Vaticana: Camera apostolica; Obligationes et solutiones; Camerale primo (1299–1560)*, vol. 1 (Zagreb: Kršćanska Sadašnjost, 1996).

<sup>84</sup> Harvey, *Episcopal Appointments*, 139; Norman Zacour, "The Cardinals' View of the Papacy, 1150–1300," in *The religious roles of the Papacy: Ideals and realities, 1150–1300*, ed. Christopher Ryan (Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Medieval Studies, 1989), 421–424.

<sup>85</sup> Zacour, "The Cardinals' View," 435.

<sup>86</sup> Kiesewetter, "L'intervento," 165.

<sup>87</sup> Election and intervention present in: Split, Hvar, Zadar, Šibenik, Krk, Osor, and Zagreb. Election but no intervention present in: Knin, Krbava, Nin, Senj, Skradin, Rab, and Trogir. For the second category it is worth to note that except for Trogir in the cases of other bishops we are lucky to know their names as not much is known about their pontificate.

did not actively remove prelates but intervened only in disputed elections, using this opportunity to quash elections of unsuitable candidates and appoint prelates closely connected to the Roman Curia. In fact, the popes started to slowly appropriate the appointments of prelates or at least lay out the legal groundwork for it well before the pontificate of John XXII. Already the constitution *Licet ecclesiarum* (1265) provided the pope with the right to appoint the benefices of all the minor clerics who died at Roman Curia, but it was Boniface VIII who, with constitution *Praesenti declaramus* (1294–1303), extended the right of appointment of all the clerics who died within a two-day journey from Rome.<sup>88</sup> With the bull *Quamquam in casu* Boniface also claimed the right to appoint a bishop if the previous one had been elected illegally.<sup>89</sup> The bull was announced in 1298 and we can assume that it was previously enacted in the case of Split.

The number of prelate translations dramatically increased during the pontificate of Boniface VIII. Yet, unlike Boniface IX (1389–1404) who later directly intervened in the succession crisis in Hungary (1382–1409) by translating unfavorable prelates and replacing them with papal supporters, this cannot be claimed for Boniface VIII. Instead, Boniface either quashed the election of the prelate and provided the dioceses with a new one (Split and Zadar) or waited for the prelate to die and then appointed a new prelate (Esztergom and Kalocsa). In this way, papal interference was not seen as an abuse but as enforcing the papal prerogatives regarding the administration of the Church.<sup>90</sup>

Trogir, for example, offered a potential opportunity in 1297 when Gregory (1282–1297), a Franciscan monk from Ancona, died and the cathedral chapter appointed Liberius (1297–1319), a Benedictine monk.<sup>91</sup> Yet the lack of sources showing the papal involvement indicates a lack of the conflict which would enable the pope to intervene and suggests that the election remained in the context of the local events – election by the cathedral chapters and then confirmation by the metropolitan, the archbishop of Split.

Local developments can contribute to our understanding of the wider situation, namely that the context of the papal policy in regards to solving the disputed elections during the 1290s can be applied to better understand the

<sup>88</sup> Harvey, *Episcopal Appointments*, 134.

<sup>89</sup> Joachim Stieber, *Pope Eugenius IV, the Council of Basel and the Secular and Ecclesiastical Authorities in the Empire: The Conflict over Supreme Authority and Power in the Church* (Leiden: Brill, 1978), 370.

<sup>90</sup> Pennington notes that “no publicist, theologian, or lawyer” at the time questioned the papal right of translations. Pennington, *Pope and Bishops*, 100.

<sup>91</sup> Ivan Lucić found in a source from 1297 that one John was elected bishop. A month later John was no longer mentioned but instead the source names Liberius. John either died or was rejected but no other sources are available. Lucić, *Povijesna svjedočanstva o Trogiru I*, 346).

election of Gregory Bickei. The bishop of Győr and royal vice-chancellor was elected as the new archbishop of Esztergom following the death of Lodomer in 1298. His election was disputed by part of the cathedral chapter, while the new archbishop also soon became an opponent to Andrew. The king soon replaced the archbishop as royal vice-chancellor with the bishop of Csanad, and tried to have that bishop appointed as archbishop, replacing Gregory. The pope did an unusual thing, as he neither confirmed nor rejected Gregory but instead named him the procurator of the diocese, in the process giving Gregory additional powers including the permission to excommunicate those who would oppose Gregory's rule. Gregory became the chief proponent of the Angevins and fierce opponent of Andrew, yet in the process lost the support of the Hungarian high clergy, which consolidated its support for King Andrew by turning to Archbishop John of Kalocsa as the new leader of the Hungarian Church.<sup>92</sup> Gregory's conflict with the king could have signaled to both the Šubići and the Apostolic See that the time had come to send Charles Robert to Hungary and use the political crisis to take over the throne.<sup>93</sup> In fact, it was Gregory, together with the Šubići, who went to Naples in 1300 to bring Charles Robert to Hungary.

It does not seem that the pope was involved in the appointments of prelates in Zagreb during the 1290s. After 1301 the popes were more active and direct in appointing prelates, with direct implications for the prelates working in support of Charles Robert's claim to the throne. For this purposes the papacy used the policy of transfers, a departure from the previous papal policy of non-involvement, at least in regards to Zagreb and central Hungary. With the death of John of Kalocsa and Gregory of Esztergom (1302–1303) the pope claimed the right to appoint their successors.<sup>94</sup> However, several things happened here. Gregory died at the Papal Curia, which gave the pope the right to appoint his successor. Since the transfer of a prelate was also a papal prerogative, Pope Benedict IX (1303–1304), previously Boniface's most valuable legate Nicola Boccasini, transferred Bishop Michael of Zagreb (1296–1303), previously a close supporter of Andrew III, to the position of archbishop of Esztergom. Michael, appointed as the bishop in 1296 through close connections with King Andrew, was thus rewarded by the pope for his active service in promoting the Angevin cause.

<sup>92</sup> A good example is the *Decretum* of 5 August 1298 when higher clergy, led by John of Kalocsa, together with lesser nobility firmly acknowledged Andrew's reign against any other pretenders or rebels. János Bak, ed., *The Laws of the Medieval Kingdom of Hungary*, vol. 1 (1000–1301) (Salt Lake City: Schlacks, 1989), 46–50; 114–117. For an overview of the situation with Gregory see: Szentgyörgy, *Borba Anžuvínaca*, 31–2, 34–5.; Skorka, "With a Little Help," 243–244.

<sup>93</sup> As suggested by Skorka, "With a Little Help," 243–260.

<sup>94</sup> Although John's successor Stephen was elected, it seems that the pope still decided to appoint him by use of papal provision. HC, 197.

This transfer gave the pope the right to appoint the next bishop of Zagreb, and Benedict here appointed Augustine Kažotić, who was from Trogir and from the same order as Benedict – the Dominicans.<sup>95</sup> Prior to that the pope had not intervened in the election of the bishop of Zagreb for some time, suggesting either that there was no complaint from the cathedral chapter or that the influence of King Andrew III on that see was too strong.<sup>96</sup>

The establishment of the diocese of Šibenik represented a widening of the social network for the local oligarchs who in the changed political circumstances obtained a direct link to the Papal Curia. Following the establishment of the new diocese, the contacts between the Šubići and the papacy only improved and brought privileges to both the Šubići and their supporters. These contacts affected the development and spread of the territories under the Šubići's rule, as Archbishop Peter of Split obtained the papal privilege to establish new dioceses. Two were established on the territory of the diocese of Split, which followed the expansion of the Šubići's rule to the southeast.<sup>97</sup> On the other hand, the people connected with the Šubići benefited from the links that the Šubići established with the papacy. For instance, in 1302 Pope Boniface VIII appointed Bishop-elect Leonard of Šibenik as the archbishop of Crete, while in 1314 Pope Clement V appointed Archbishop-elect Alexander of Zadar to the same see as Leonard. Curiously, the pope also connected Leonard's new function with the position of Latin Patriarch of Constantinople.<sup>98</sup>

The Šubići maintained their political and economic contacts with the Angevins even after Charles Robert's arrival to Hungary. Paul and George went to Rome and Naples and the royal court in Naples gave gifts to the Šubići but

<sup>95</sup> ... *nos provisionem dicte ecclesie Zagradiensis ea vice disposition sedis apostolice reservantes...*, CDC VIII, 60, December 9 1303.

<sup>96</sup> During the thirteenth century the pope tried to intervene twice, first trying unsuccessfully to investigate the royal candidate Philip (1248), and later appointing papal candidate Timothy (1263) by directly rejecting the royal candidate. Following the death of John (1287–95), who was the candidate of the cathedral chapter, Michael became the next bishop. His appointment was most probably came on the suggestion by King Andrew as the cathedral chapter had good relationship with the king and Michael was brother of *comes Siculorum* Peter (1294–1299). Michael would act as the backbone of the royal rule in Slavonia. (CDC VII, 192–193, 285–287).

<sup>97</sup> Very little is known of the first several decades about these two dioceses. Peter established Duvno and Makarska, both situated at the edges of the rule of the Šubići and both clearly marking in which direction the Šubići were expanding their rule. Damir Karbić presumed that they were established between 1305 and 1311. Karbić, *The Šubići of Bribir*, 340. Also, see: CDC VIII, 289–290.

<sup>98</sup> Despite the fact that the patriarch was not in Constantinople, this was politically and financially still influential position. Leonard was appointed in 1302, while with the appointment of Alexander in 1314 the union between Constantinople and Crete was terminated. Karbić, *The Šubići of Bribir*, 337–339; also HC, 206, 215.

it seems that accomplishment of the main purpose – to bring the Angevin pretender to Hungary – also weakened the links between the oligarch family and Naples. During the second coronation of Charles Robert in 1309, performed in the presence of Legate Gentile, the Šubići were not personally present but were instead represented by Archbishop Peter.

### *Conclusion*

While scholars have often understood the popes, the Šubići, and the Angevins as working together throughout the entirety of the 1290s, this is not necessarily true. The events of 1297–1299 particularly reveal the multiple interests and perspectives of these three parties, which became fully recognizable when they were eventually aligned in 1298 with the establishment of the diocese of Šibenik. The popes frequently intervened and took over the appointments of the prelates from the local communities in pursuit of their own interests. On the other hand the Angevins, led largely by Queen Mary, used their connections in Rome to obtain support for the Šubići, who in return obtained access to the papacy, from which they benefitted in the following decades. The same members of the Šubići had been in power since the 1270s, yet their attempts regarding Church reform in the areas they controlled met opposition, both locally and internationally. The actions available to the Angevins in their attempts to claim the throne changed during the 1290s, matching both the developments in Naples and the changing circumstances in the Kingdom of Hungary. Thus, the changes occurring during the 1290s in Church organization on an international level interacted with and affected the changes on the local level.

Although the papacy had intervened in Church policy in Croatia-Dalmatia before, during the 1290s papal interference and the expansion of papal rights reached an unprecedented level. The papacy used all of the mechanisms at its disposal. It claimed jurisdiction in the disputed elections, sent cardinal-legates to investigate, and expanded papal rights in cases of the transfer of prelates and the deaths of prelates in Rome. On one hand this necessitated conflict within the local communities, which then gave the pope the right to intervene, but even when conflict was not present, the pope could use his expanded powers to influence appointments. While this was the case for Croatia-Dalmatia, the example of Zagreb (Michael in 1296) showed a different situation: the lack of conflict during the election could suggest the extent of royal power regarding the appointments of the prelates in areas closer to the centre of the kingdom. This can be further corroborated with the situation in Esztergom when the papacy chose a careful approach to the election, an approach which in fact benefited both the Angevins and the papacy.



What one could conclude from this paper is that the papacy had a clear mission of the expansion of its rights, but what the sources show was the gradual increase in papal power, which increased throughout this period. Further, it is evident that this expansion also depended on the personal dispositions of the individual popes. While prior to 1297 the papacy increasingly involved itself in disputed elections, the events of 1297–99 led the papacy to expand its powers and possibilities for involvement in the succession crisis. Rather than simply supporting or opposing a certain pretender to the throne, the Apostolic See became aware of its options to influence the succession crisis, as the crisis also helped the papacy to pursue certain goals and expand its pool of possible allies.

Sometimes it is difficult to fully understand the local dynamics and multiple relationships between various parties. For instance, due to the nature of sources it is difficult to reveal the positions of the “losers” towards the papal appropriation of prelate appointments, namely the cathedral chapters, local clergy and the prelates-elected who were forced to resign. In fact, based on their response – or sometimes lack of response – we might conclude that the local communities obeyed the papal decisions even when they did not agree with them. Yet the local factor must have influenced the dynamic of the relationship between the appointed prelates and their communities.

On the other hand, the lack of influence or even presence of the secular rulers of Croatia and Dalmatia – King Andrew III and the Republic of Venice – can also be understood in different ways. During the 1290s there was a lack of efficient royal control in Croatia, but the absence of Venice regarding the appointment of the prelates is difficult to explain. It could be that, unlike a century later, during this period Venice had no direct influence on the appointments, leaving this instead to its patriarch of Grado.

Croatia-Dalmatia represents only a smaller province of Christendom, with a small sample of sources incomparable with its western counterparts. But on the basis of this small region, wider and far-reaching conclusions in the dynamics of papal power, local communities and pretenders can be seen.

**PUTEREA PAPALĂ, COMUNITĂȚI LOCALE ȘI PRETENDENȚI:  
BISERICA DIN CROAȚIA, DALMAȚIA ȘI SLAVONIA ȘI LUPȚA  
PENTRU TRONUL REGATULUI UNGARIEI-CROAȚIEI (1290–1301)**

*Rezumat*

Cercetările anterioare s-au concentrat mai ales asupra modului în care Sfântul Scaun a sprijinit sau nu, a obstrucționat sau a ignorat accederea Angevinilor la tronul Ungariei între 1290 și 1301. Indiferent de opțiunea papală istoricii au argumentat cum anume se

explică schimbările care au apărut în această perioadă în organizarea bisericii în Croația, Dalmația și Slavonia și rolul pe care aceste schimbări l-au jucat în urcarea apoi a lui Carol Robert pe tronul Ungariei, în 1301. În schimb, eu am analizat evoluțiile locale și modul în care acestea s-au interconectat cu situația internațională și cum s-au influențat unele pe celelalte. Ceea ce include evaluarea motivelor din spatele acțiunilor a trei actori majori care l-au adus pe Carol Robert în Ungaria: Sfântul Scaun, curtea Angevină din Napoli și oligarhii locali, nobilii Šubići. Cu toate că se pot aduce și alte explicații privind cooperarea dintre acești trei factori, respectiv, cei de natură culturală, economică și politică, studiul de față se concentrează asupra schimbărilor din cadrul structurilor bisericii locale. Am urmărit modul în care fiecare dintre părțile implicate a contribuit la aceste evoluții și cum au utilizat spre propriul folos reformele bisericii locale. Studiul evaluează agendele inextricabil legate ale Sfântului Scaun, Angevinilor și nobililor Šubići la finele secolului al XIII-lea.