

Viri fideles.

Methodological Aspects of a Medieval Personal Network

Péter Báling

ZUSAMMENFASSUNG

Viri fideles. Methodische Aspekte eines mittelalterlichen personellen Netzwerks

In diesem Aufsatz sollen die unterschiedlichen Methoden aufgezeigt werden, mit denen die neapolitanischen Anjou einen Unterstützerkreis in Ungarn etablieren und so ihre Ansprüche auf den ungarischen Thron geltend machen wollten. Als der junge Caroberto – später als Karl I. König von Ungarn – im Jahre 1300 in Split eintraf, regierte in Ungarn der rechtmäßige König Andreas III. Split, die dalmatinische Küste und Kroatien wurden von der mächtigen Familie Šubići unter deren Ban Paul kontrolliert. Vor der Ankunft des jungen Thronanwärters versuchten beide Parteien, d. h. die Anjou und die Árpáden, sich der Loyalität des Ban zu versichern. Die Studie präsentiert die wichtigsten zeitgenössischen Quellen und vergleicht die unterschiedlichen Vorgehensweisen der konkurrierenden Familien. Die Vergabe von Ländereien und Titeln war eine damals übliche Praxis zur Sicherung von Loyalität, und beide Parteien nutzten diese Methode mit großem Erfolg. Obwohl der Hof der Anjou in Neapel über keine wirkliche Macht in Ungarn verfügte und deren Schenkungen somit nur nominell sein konnten, blieben die Šubići Karls Anliegen gegenüber loyal. Der ungarischen Historiografie zufolge führten hauptsächlich die räumliche Nähe und die engen wirtschaftlichen Beziehungen dazu, dass der Ban an der Seite der Anjou blieb. Diese Feststellung kann jedoch ausgedehnt werden auf das personelle Netzwerk Karls II. von Anjou, König von Sizilien und Großvater Carobertos, den er bei dessen Ansprüchen auf den ungarischen Thron maßgeblich unterstützte. Die Šubići und die Anjou hatten zu dieser Zeit bereits langjährige Beziehungen unterhalten. Die Quellen belegen, dass der Ban, seine Verwandten und deren Gesandten Neapel häufig besucht und sich so aufgrund persönlicher Bekanntschaft enge Beziehungen zwischen den beiden Familien entwickelt haben.

KEYWORDS: Hungary, Croatia, Sicily, Angevins, Charles Robert, Subići, Angevin-Hungarian relations

Those major changes during the 14th century that dramatically redrew the social, economic and political conditions in Eastern Europe are palpable in Hungary as well. From the middle of the 13th century a tangible transformation began in all segments of life. In Hungary, out of the diverse social structure of the Árpád age, a single layer of nobility and serfdom began to form at the turn of the century. The rearrangement of economic conditions after the middle of the 13th century saw emergence of regional markets and the significant expansion of trade and merchandise. Noticeable settler movement can be observed after the years following the Mongol invasion and, in the northern part of the country, where the *hospes* movement was at its most intense, a series of privileged communities were created and, with the reorganization of the administration of territorial funds, nine new counties were formed. The extinction in the male line in the ruling families contributed significantly to these changes. Both the dynasty of the Árpáds in Hungary and the dynasty of Přemysls in the Czech kingdom died out without a legitimate heir to the throne. It was not only Eastern Europe that was affected by this change; in France, the Capet dynasty that had ruled since the 10th century died out without a male heir in 1328. Powerful and established noble families like the Habsburgs, Luxemburgs and Neapolitan Angevins rose to power swiftly during this period.

In Hungary in the early Árpád age, royal power dominated but at the end of the century the barons were able to crush the royal authority and the kingdom faced a turbulent period. However the crisis was not new-fangled: the young King Ladislaus IV (1272-1290) was a puppet in the hands of powerful baronial leagues. He was even held in captivity and used during political bargains.¹ The reign of Andrew III (1290-1301), who acceded to the throne after the death of Ladislaus IV, was not accepted by some of the most powerful barons of the country. However he had enemies, not only amidst the barons, but beyond the borders of the kingdom as well: aside from others in Naples, the royal court of Charles II (1285-1309) and Queen Mary deemed the rule of the 'Venetian' Andrew as illegitimate.² Moreover, during the summer of 1300, when Hungary was still under the reign of King Andrew, Charles II sent off his young 12 year old grandson Caroberto³ to Hungary to enforce his

¹ For more details see JENŐ SZÜCS: *Az utolsó Árpádok* [The Last Árpáds], Budapest 2002, pp. 387-404.

² On 21.04.1291, Charles II appealed to the Hungarian nobles and stated that a certain Andrew named 'Venetian' was usurping the kingship and the crown as well, see GUSZTÁV WENZEL (ed.): *Magyar diplomáciai emlékek az Anjou-korból* (MDEA) [Hungarian Diplomatic Memories from the Angevin Era], vol. 1, Budapest 1874, p. 76 (no. 94).

³ ALEXANDER DOMANOVSKY (ed.): *Chronici Hungarici compositio saeculi XIV*, in: EMERICUS SZENTPÉTERY (ed.): *Scriptores rerum Hungaricarum*, vol. 1, Budapest 1937 [reprint Budapest 1999], pp. 217-505, here p. 478: 'in terra sua vocaverunt Carobertum

claim on the throne, on account of his ancestral links to the Hungarian holy kings on the female line. With the sudden death of King Andrew III the young Anjou scion's situation considerably improved but most of the Hungarian barons and prelates did not side with him. According to the words of the memorable and much quoted charter of palatine Steven from the genus Ákos, the king was mourned by the nobles and prelates just as 'Rachel mourned his sons'⁴ and 'they set themselves thinking how and where they could find a new ruler from the blood of the holy king by the help of the divine grace'.⁵ So they decided to elect the son of the Bohemian king Wenceslas⁶, who was betrothed since 1298 to Elisabeth⁷, the daughter of the late king Andrew III.

Nowadays, we know much more about the events that followed owing to those historiographical methods that were introduced in Hungary by Gyula Pauler.⁸ To describe the essence of these methods we might state the following: with the proper number of diplomatic sources a royal itinerary and an archontological database can be constructed. The charters' place of origin and their issue dates are very helpful for this task. With the assistance of the royal itinerary and the newly introduced sub-discipline of archontology, the historical past becomes far more knowable and the correspondence between these events can be unfolded as well, not to mention that the chronological deter-

quasi Carolum Robertum, in Hungaria autem ablato Roberto ipsum Hungari Karolum vocaverunt'.

⁴ Matthew 2:18.

⁵ IMRE NAGY, GYULA NAGY (eds.): *Anjou kori okmánytár. Codex Diplomaticus Hungaricus Andegavensis (AKO)*, vol. 1-7, Budapest 1878-1920, here vol. 1. pp. 52-53 (no. 47.): 'Demum eciam domino Andree Illustri Regi Hungarie divina vocante clemencia rebus humanis exempto ultimo aureo ramusculo a progenie stirpe ac sanguine sancti Regis Stephani primi Regis Hungarorum per paternam lineam descendenti extincto, cum uniuersi ecclesiarum prelati amministracionem habentes et Barones proceres ac uniuersi nobiles et cuiusquis status homines Regni Hungarie cum se vero ac naturali domino desolatos sentirent scirent et intelligerent de morte eiusdem more Rachelis deplorantes et immensum conturbati et admodum solliciti qualiter et quemadmodum sibi divina desuper disponente clemencia futurum dominum de sanguine sancti Regis polulatum possent et valerent inuenire, cogitantes et concorditer attractantes demum eciam cum pari voto et communi consilio in dominum Ladislaum Regem Hungarie nunc Regnantem primogenitum videlicet Magnifici principis domini Wenceslai Regis Bohemie et Polonie asensissent et ad impetrandum eundem, Ladislaum Banum de genere Ratholth et magistrum Nicolaum filium Demetrii predictum cum aliis Nobilibus Regni in suis legacionibus destinassent.'

⁶ DOMANOVSKY (as in footnote 3), pp. 479-480.

⁷ MÓR WERTNER: *Az Árpádok családi története [Genealogy of the House of Árpád]*, Nagybecskerek 1892, pp. 580-582.

⁸ GYULA PAULER: *A magyar nemzet története az Árpádházi királyok alatt [The History of the Hungarian Nation during the Reign of the House of Árpád]*, vol. 2, Budapest 1893, pp. 602-608; PÁL ENGEL: *Az ország újraegyesítése. I. Károly küzdelmei az oligarchák ellen (1310-1323)*, [The Reunion of the Country. The Struggles of Charles I against the Oligarchs (1310-1323)], in: *Századok* 122 (1988), pp. 89-146, here p. 92.

mination will be far more accurate.⁹ As a matter of fact, these proceedings were not new in Europe when they were first introduced and applied by the Hungarian historians. The devisors can be found among the members of the mid-19th century German historiographical school led by Georg Heinrich Pertz.¹⁰ Using this practice Pál Engel—who compares the methodology to a ‘giant and peculiar puzzle’—and Gyula Kristó managed to achieve results, which draw attention to numerous events that were formerly unknown or badly interpreted, and in many cases they managed to dispell the obscurity from certain affairs. However as Pál Engel points out, Hungarian medieval history is quite insufficient on sources, so the information that can be accessed by the narrative reports are infinitesimal compared to the data gained by the use of charters.¹¹

In this short study we seek to reconstruct the methods used by the Neapolitan Angevin court to build a Hungarian support circle. Moreover we aim to compare these methods with the proceedings utilized by the legitimately crowned Hungarian king Andrew III. In addition, our investigation attempts to address the question—which was excluded from previous network analysis—of whether the success of constructing such a support circle lies only in geographical proximity or if we can also count personal acquaintances as an essential factor?

To find answers to these questions, we first have to briefly describe the sources through which the Angevin’s and the Hungarian king’s established personal network can be uncovered. These contemporary sources can be divided into three categories. The narrative ones tend to be important to reconstruct the course of events and the charters, letters and the reports of various envoys both reveal the methods used by the opposing parties and respectively highlight the existing parties and stakeholders that existed during this era. The latter source group is also capable of illustrating the balance of power or even the power shifting at a given historical moment. For the second time we would like to answer the previously posed questions through the example of the most influential baronial family, the Šubići, who ruled quite independently in Croatia at the beginning of the 14th century.

The most important narrative sources of the era are quite laconic and from those that arose in Hungary, the 14th century chronicle composition¹² is the most reliable. Although the chronicle was compiled during the 14th century¹³,

⁹ Ibidem, pp. 92-93.

¹⁰ Ibidem, p. 92; GYULA KRISTÓ: I. Károly király harcai a tartományurak ellen (1310-1323) [The Struggles of Charles I against the Barons (1310-1323)], in: Századok 137 (2003), pp. 297-347, here p. 297.

¹¹ ENGEL, Az ország (as in footnote 8), pp. 92-93.

¹² DOMANOVSKY (as in footnote 3).

¹³ JÁNOS BOLLÓK (transl.): Képes Krónika [Illuminated Chronicle], Budapest 2004, pp. 233-256; GYULA KRISTÓ: Magyar historiográfia. Történetírás a középkori Magya-

it contains only little information about the period. The reason behind this is to be found in the compilers' belligerence towards the Angevin rule in Hungary.¹⁴ The foreign sources contain only fragments of data, however they should not be underestimated. The chronicle of the Florentine citizen Giovanni Villani¹⁵ makes us more familiar with certain contemporary Italian affairs including Neapolitan occurrences as well. The chronicle of Micha Madius¹⁶ reports on Caroberto's¹⁷ stay in Zagreb.¹⁸ The chronicle of the Anonymous from Leoben¹⁹ tells us about Charles's stay at the Cistercian monastery of Bélakút (Belae fons). Those sources that arose in Regensburg²⁰ preserved information about the first coronation of Charles, and in addition Czech narrative sources recorded the coronation ceremony of Wenceslas.²¹

Contrarily, the diplomatic source material rests on a far wider base. The grandiose work of Georgius Fejér²², that consists of more than 40 volumes, published charters from the period, but only at the end of the 19th century did the Hungarian Academy of Sciences decide to release the thematic collections of records from the diplomatic sources of the Angevin era in Hungary. As a

rországon [Hungarian Historiography. Historiography in Medieval Hungary], Budapest 2002, pp. 78-88.

¹⁴ Ibidem, pp. 80-82.

¹⁵ PHILIP H. WICKSTEED (ed.): Villani's Chronicle. Being Selections from the First Nine Books of the Croniche Fiorentine of Giovanni Villani, transl. by ROSE E. SELFE, London 1906, pp. 315-316; Croniche di Giovanni, Matteo e Filippo Villani, vol. 1-2, Trieste 1857/58.

¹⁶ For his identity see ÉVA B. HALÁSZ: Micha Madius de Barbazanis—a történetíró és spalatói nemes patricius [Micha Madius de Barbazanis—the Historian and Noble Patrician of Spalato], in: Acta Universitatis Szegediensis. Acta Historica 135 (2013), pp. 59-70.

¹⁷ Caroberto was his original name, but in Hungary the name Charles Robert is deeply ingrained in the historiography and in the general thinking as well. The king himself used the name Charles I during his reign in Hungary. Hereafter we will refer to him as Charles. See ENIKŐ CSUKOVITS: Az Anjouk Magyarországon. Vol. 1: I. Károly és uralkodása (1301-1342) [The Angevins in Hungary. Vol. 1: Charles I and his Reign (1301-1342)], Budapest 2012, p. 6.

¹⁸ IOANNES GEORGIUS SCHWANDTNERUS (ed.): *Scriptores rerum Hungaricarum veteres ac geniu* (SRHVG), vol. 1-3, Vindobonae 1746-1748, here vol. 3, pp. 636-653.

¹⁹ ALBINUS FRANCISCUS GOMBOS (ed.): *Anonymi Leobienensis Chronicon—Catalogus fontium historiae Hungaricae aevo ducum et regum ex stirpe Arpad descendentium ab anno Christi DCCC usque ad annum MCCC* (CFH), vol. 1-3, Budapest 1937/38, here vol. 1, p. 280.

²⁰ See ATTILA ZSOLDOS: Anjou Károly első koronázása [The First Coronation of Charles Anjou], in: TAMÁS KÖRMENDI, GÁBOR THOROCZKAY (eds.): *Auxilium historiae. Tanulmányok a hetvenesztendős Bertényi Iván tiszteletére*, Budapest 2009, pp. 405-413.

²¹ PETR ŽITAVSÝ (ed.): *Kronika zbraslavská*, in: JOSEF EMLER (ed.): *Fontes rerum Bohemicarum. Prameny dejin ceskych*, vol. 4, Pragae 1884, pp. 1-337.

²² GEORGIUS FEJÉR (ed.): *Codex diplomaticus Hungariae ecclesiasticus ac civilis*, Budae 1829-1866.

result, two major works came out, namely the edition of Gusztáv Wenzel²³ and that of Imre Nagy²⁴. Both of them published diplomatic sources from the Angevin era either from Hungary or from foreign countries. The release of Angevin sources gained momentum in 1990 when the first volume of the diplomatic archives of the Angevin era²⁵ was published in the edition of Gyula Kristó. The work is not finished yet; the editorial works of a new volume are still in progress. In the first five volumes that contain documents from the years between 1301 and 1320, more than 4000 charters are published, which is nearly the half of the known diplomas from the whole Árpád age.²⁶

All kinds of contemporary letters and missives could serve as an excellent source as well. The intense exchange of letters between pope Boniface VIII and his legate Niccoló Boccassini²⁷ preserved important information on the opposing parties in Hungary. The reports of certain envoys, i. e. Petrus Bonzano²⁸, King Andrew's emissary to the Holy See, or Mario Marignon²⁹, envoy of the Aragonian king James II, are also bequeathed to posterity. They are not just exceptional sources but can also be used as a control against the narrative authorities.

As for the royal itineraries: we might say that since the 19th century both the Hungarian and Croatian historiography were occupied with the gathering of all the itinerary data that can be accessed. First Károly Ráth³⁰ published his writings about the royal itinerary of King Charles I, which was followed from the Croatian side by the work of Ferdo Šišić³¹. Béla Sebestyén³² also compiled a new royal itinerary in 1938. Unfortunately these works are now obsolete, so it is not accidental that Pál Engel did not use them when he published

²³ MDEA (as in footnote 2), vol. 1-3, Budapest 1874-1876.

²⁴ AKO (as in footnote 5), vol. 1-7.

²⁵ TIBOR ALMÁSI, LÁSZLÓ BLAZOVICH et al. (eds.): Anjou-kori oklevéltár. Documenta res Hungaricas tempore regnum Andegavensium illustrantia (AOkl.), vol. 1-31, Budapest—Szeged 1990-2007.

²⁶ GYULA KRISTÓ: Magyarország története 895-1301 [History of Hungary 895-1301], Budapest 2007, p. 296.

²⁷ AOkl (as in footnote 25), vol. 1, Budapest—Szeged 1990, passim.

²⁸ GUSZTÁV WENZEL (ed.): Árpádkori új okmánytár. Codex diplomaticus Arpadianus continuatus (ÁÚO), vol. 5, Pest 1864, pp. 260-261 (no. 168), pp. 262-263 (no. 169), pp. 263-264 (no. 170).

²⁹ HEINRICH FINKE: Acta Aragonensia. Quellen zur deutschen, italienischen, französischen, spanischen, zur Kirchen- und Kulturgeschichte aus der diplomatischen Korrespondenz Jaymes II. (1291-1327), vol. 1, Berlin—Leipzig 1908, pp. 241-242.

³⁰ KÁROLY RÁTH: A magyar királyok hadjáratai, utazásai és tartózkodási helyei [The Military Campaigns, Journeys and Residences of the Hungarian Kings], Győr 1861, pp. 47-49.

³¹ FERDO ŠIŠIĆ: Itinerarij Karla I. (1301-1342) [The Itinerary of Charles I. (1301-1342)], in: Vjestnik kr. horvatsko-slavonsko-dalmatinskog zemeljskog arkiva, Zagreb 1902, pp. 134-136.

³² BÉLA SEBESTYÉN: A magyar királyok tartózkodási helyei [The Residences of the Hungarian Kings], Budapest 1938, pp. 32-35.

the latest royal itinerary of Charles I in his monography-like study, which addressed the years from 1310 to 1323.³³ He also published the archontological database of the period.³⁴

It is an old finding of Hungarian historiography that the Angevin interests took hold mainly at the southern ends of the kingdom. Within the framework of this study—taking its size into consideration—we cannot elaborate on all the known relations of the House of Anjou in Hungary. The Neapolitan Angevins tried to ensure the loyalty of most powerful baronial families living in the southern part of the kingdom, namely the Šubići, Babonići and the Frankopans, with the same methods.¹ Therefore we have endeavoured to present a well-known figure, who was nevertheless ignored by Hungarian historiography, on the basis of the methodology outlined above. The person in question is Paul (Pavao) Šubić, who paved the way for the Angevin interests in Hungary and helped the young Charles to become one of the greatest rulers of the Kingdom of Hungary during the Middle Ages. Those forces that were backing the juvenile Charles were the backbone of an extended personal network that bore the mark of the tireless organizational work of the Sicilian king, Charles II. The young pretender, being a child, did not take part actively in this work. With the death of his father, Charles Martell, ‘the firstborn of the king of Sicily and Jerusalem, by the grace of God king of Hungary, duke of Salerno, the lord of the Saint Angel-Mountain’³⁵, the Angevins buried the man who had designs to the Hungarian throne, but they did not bury their claims. Charles Robert was a 12 old year child when he was sent off to Hungary by his grandfather to enforce the claim that he had inherited from his father.

Hungarian historiography pays distinct attention to the Angevin era. After the chaotic period of the late Árpád age the Angevin kings managed to build a very strong kingdom that seized the hegemony in Central Europe during the 14th century. However nearly all historical works are contented with the laconic statement that initially Charles Robert’s supporters consisted only of ‘some barons from the southern region of the kingdom and certain ecclesiastical circles’.³⁶ If we take a closer look at the relevant charters issued by the Neapolitan court, it is conspicuous that the members of the Šubić family appear quite a few times among these ‘southern barons’.³⁷

³³ ENGEL, *Az ország* (as in footnote 8), pp. 136-139.

³⁴ PÁL ENGEL: *Magyarország világi archontológiája 1301-1457* [The Lay Archontology of Hungary 1301-1457], vol. 1-2, Budapest 1996.

³⁵ ‘Karolus Illustris Regis Jerusalem et Sicilie primogenitus, Dei gracia Rex Ungarie, Princeps Salernitanus, et Honoris Montis Sancti Angeli Dominus’, see ÁÚO (as in footnote 28), vol. 10, Pest 1873, pp. 125-126 (no. 189).

³⁶ GYULA KRISTÓ: *Az Anjou-kor háborúi* [The Wars of the Angevin Era], Budapest 1988, p. 11.

³⁷ On the genealogy of the Šubići see DAMIR KARBIĆ: *A brebiri Subicsok az örökös báni cím elvesztéséig* (1322) [The Šubići of Bribir until the Loss of the Perpetual Title of

Paul Šubić's name appears for the first time in sources from the year 1272, shortly after the coronation of Ladislaus IV.³⁸ In May 1273 he bore the title of count of Spalato³⁹, and in the same year in August, he held the title of *ban* as well.⁴⁰ According to the previously mentioned charter that was issued in August, the *ban* threatened the city of Trau (Trogir), which suffered damages. Therefore King Ladislaus IV warned him that 'he should restrain his hands from further persecution of the city and its citizens'.⁴¹ The first relevant connection between House of Anjou and the Šubić family stands in connection with this conflict as well. The cities of Spalato (Split) and Sebenico (Šibenik)—both under the influence of the family of the *ban*—started a war against Trau.⁴² The two aforementioned cities entered into a contract with Charles I (1266-1285), king of Sicily, with the knowledge of the *ban*, but this act was unbeknown to the King of Hungary.⁴³ The Sicilian king had already taken control of several islands in the Adriatic region by that time.⁴⁴ The alliance was struck nominally against the pirates of the city of Almissa (Omiš), but apparently it aimed against Trau.⁴⁵ The Hungarian king Ladislaus IV dispensed Paul Šubić from the office of the Banate in 1274 but with the help of Nicolaus from genus Gutkeled, who was re-elected as *ban* of Croatia and Dalmatia.⁴⁶ So Paul Šubić and his relatives were members of the political *familia* of the most influential and powerful baron of the southern region of the kingdom, namely Joachim from genus Gutkeled. Due to this, his political upsweep was quick. However, after the death of Joachim in 1277 the genus Gutkeled began to fall from power in Hungary. The counts of Bribir⁴⁷—the Šubići—suffered no hard hit from this event and at the end of the 1280's, the members of the family controlled almost the whole territory of the medieval Croatia and only the most northern part that was adjacent to Slavonia re-

Ban (1322)], in: SÁNDOR BENE, GÁBOR HAUSNER (eds.): *A Zrínyiek a magyar és horvát történelemben*, Budapest 2007, pp. 15-38, here p. 17.

³⁸ TADIJA SMIČIKLAS (ed.): *Codex diplomaticus regni Croatiae Dalmatiae et Slavoniae* (CDCDS), vol. 6, Zagreb 1908, p. 4 (no. 5); KARBIĆ (as in footnote 37), p. 22.

³⁹ CDCDS (as in footnote 38), vol. 6, p. 30 (no. 30).

⁴⁰ *Ibidem*, vol. 5, Zagreb 1907, p. 43 (no. 39).

⁴¹ *Ibidem*, vol. 6, p. 43 (no. 39): 'a molestationibus eorundem civium Tragurii omnino retineas manus tuas'.

⁴² KARBIĆ (as in footnote 37), p. 22.

⁴³ *Ibidem*, p. 23; FERENC SALAMON: *Az első Zrínyiek [The First Zrínyis]*, Pest 1865, pp. 50-52.

⁴⁴ KARBIĆ (as in footnote 37), p. 23; SALAMON (as in footnote 43), pp. 50-52.

⁴⁵ KARBIĆ (as in footnote 37), p. 23; SALAMON (as in footnote 43), pp. 51-53.

⁴⁶ SZÜCS (as in footnote 1), pp. 391-404.

⁴⁷ The original name of the genus was Brebir, the name Šubić appeared much later in the sources presumably as a personal name. According to KARBIĆ (as in footnote 37), p. 16, there is a correlation with the naming mechanism in medieval Poland. Cf. JAN PAKULSKI: *The Development of Clan Names in Medieval Poland*, in: *History and Society in Central Europe 2* (1994), pp. 85-96.

mained beyond their authority.⁴⁸ After the death of King Ladislaus IV the Šubići interfered in the conflict between the Kačić genus and Venice, which was started by Venice on the grounds of the plunder of the Almissian pirates. This war lasted until March 1294 and was interrupted by various cessations of arms and peace negotiations.⁴⁹

The events around the fulfilment of the archiepiscopal seat of Spalato show the depth of the connections between the Šubići and the Angevins. In 1294, after the death of the former archbishop, the clergy of Spalato elected James as the new archbishop, who however failed to request a confirmation from the pope. A few years later in 1297, *comes* George (Juraj), the brother of the *ban*, took an advantage of this and rushed to Rome to procure the appointment of the chaplain of Queen Mary, the wife of the Sicilian King Charles II.⁵⁰

Therefore it is hardly a coincidence that Charles II recognized that the main supporters of his family's claim could be the Šubići since they had enough influence and military power to bring his son and grandson near to the Hungarian throne.

The Angevins followed a practice that had already been common during the centuries to gain loyal supporters: they donated land and possessions to those barons and prelates whom they expected to strengthen their cause or whose loyalty they simply wanted to reinforce and retain. However a question arises as to how valid the donations of the Angevins could have been. They possessed no power in Hungary at that time compared to the grants of King Andrew III who was widely accepted by the Hungarian nobles and prelates as a legitimate king. The Neapolitan court's claim on the throne was based on the family relations between the Árpáds and the Angevins. They stated that, with the death of Ladislaus IV—in Naples he was held as the last king from the House Árpád—the Hungarian crown belonged rightfully to his sister, Queen Mary, the wife of Charles II.⁵¹ This right was transferred by the Queen to her firstborn son Charles Martell on 6 January 1292.⁵² However, Charles Martell suddenly died in August 1295, so his son, the young Charles, the future king of Hungary, inherited this right. When the Angevins, either Charles Martel or his father Charles II, granted land in Hungary they did so based on royal prerogative since they held Charles Martell as the legitimate heir to the throne. Naples tried to tighten the relations with the Šubići by donations and confirmations of land, title and office. After the proclamation in

⁴⁸ KARBIĆ (as in footnote 37), p. 23.

⁴⁹ Ibidem, p. 24.

⁵⁰ AUGUSTINUS THEINER (ed.): *Vetera monumenta historica Hungariam sacram illustrantia*, vol. 1, Romae 1859, pp. 381-382; SALAMON (as in footnote 43), pp. 83-85.

⁵¹ For detailed information on the marriages between the two dynasties see CSUKOVITS (as in footnote 17), pp. 45-48; FERENC PATEK: *Az Árpádok és Anjouk családi összeköttetése* [The Family Connections of the Árpáds and Angevins], in: *Századok* 52 (1918), pp. 449-495; WERTNER, *Az Árpádok*, (as in footnote 7), pp. 510-514.

⁵² MDEA (as in footnote 2), vol. 1, pp. 83-84 (no. 100).

January 1292, in August of the same year, the head of the Neapolitan Angevins, Charles II, with the sanction of Charles Martell, granted the whole territory of Croatia from the *comitatus* of Hulm ('comitatus de Chelum') to the Gozd Mountains and Modrus 'with all its lords, vassals, cities, castles and villages, with the adjacent islands and all its rights and accessories' to Paul and his brothers George and Mladen and their inheritors and legal heirs as well. This was a compensation for all those merits that Paul and his family gained while they were supporting the claim of the Angevins in Hungary.⁵³

The donation of land was effective not only in the hands of the Angevins. King Andrew III also confirmed the possessions and titles of the *ban*. Moreover, the king granted hereditary rights over the Maritime Banate to Paul Šubić.⁵⁴ In addition as we stated above, the rule of King Andrew III was accepted as legitimate, so his donations were more lawful than the charters from Naples.

Despite all of this, *ban* Paul persisted in supporting the Angevin interests. This is not just due to the donations although admittedly they were not of secondary importance. As addressed above, the connection between *ban* Paul and the House of Anjou dates back further than the tragic death of King Ladislaus IV and hereby the asseveration of the Neapolitan claims. In addition to the obvious political connections a strong economic intergrowth is palpable. A charter from January 1293 allows the export of 200 *salmas* of grain to the agents of the *ban* from any port in Apulia.⁵⁵ On 28 May 1295 Paul Šubić received permission to export 1000 *salmas* of grain⁵⁶ followed by another permission on 4 March 1296.⁵⁷ The latter charter reveals that the *ban* had the right to sail another 1000 *salmas* of grain to Slavonia to supply his castles.⁵⁸ The Sicilian ruler took the lion's share from the maintenance of the Slavonian castles: in 1297 300 *salmas*, in September 1299 1000 *salmas* and in September 1305 another 1000 *salmas* of grain was shipped from the ports of the Sicilian Kingdom.⁵⁹ Although there are gaps between the dates of these command letters, we can be sure that the permits were commonly granted from year to year. In any case, the *ban* had greater need of grain than money:

⁵³ 'Concedimus etiam et damus dictis fratribus et predictis heredibus eorum de Croatia et Dalmatia tantum, quantum a finibus Comitatus de Chelum usque ad terram Gaczecham et Modursam, cum omnibus Barononibus, Vassalis, Civitatibus, Castris et villis ac omnibus infra se positis maris insulis adiacentibus, et omnibus iuribus et pertinetiis suis tenenda, regenda, habenda et possidenda per ipsos predictos omnia libere ad eorum omnimodam voluntatem.' See MDEA (as in footnote 2), vol. 1, pp. 95-96 (no. 117); CDCDS (as in footnote 38), vol. 7, Zagreb 1909, pp. 104-105 (no. 86).

⁵⁴ CDCDS (as in footnote 38), vol. 7, pp. 163-164 (no. 144).

⁵⁵ MDEA (as in footnote 2), vol. 1, pp. 100-101 (no. 125).

⁵⁶ Ibidem, p. 421 (no. 399).

⁵⁷ Ibidem, p. 129 (no. 154).

⁵⁸ Ibidem, pp. 127-128 (no. 153): 'salmas mille ad generalem mensuram, ferendas per mare ad Partes Slavoniae pro munitione castrorum suorum'.

⁵⁹ CDCDS (as in footnote 38), vol. 7, pp. 203-204 (no. 182).

when Charles II endowed 100 ounces of gold yearly to Paul Šubić⁶⁰, the *ban* almost immediately traded in the money for 1000 *salmas* of grain that was to be shipped yearly.⁶¹ In addition, Naples offered protection to the Dalmatian cities as well. The king of Sicily, owing to the pleas of *comes* George, reimbursed all the losses that Damianus from the city of Trau had to endure due to piracy.⁶²

The Neapolitan diplomacy worked on all fronts in order to achieve its goal. Charles II used every means at his disposal to improve his family's position, in Hungary with threats⁶³ and alluring donations of land and title⁶⁴, at the Holy See⁶⁵ and in Venice⁶⁶ with negotiations. Between the years of 1290 and 1301, when Charles set foot the land of the Hungarian Kingdom for the first time, the exchange of envoys intensified. At that time it was an already established custom to make contact by sending envoys and messengers.⁶⁷ The envoys also gathered information on the current political situation.⁶⁸ In this way Charles II was able to become familiar with the rather chaotic political stage in Hungary and in the light of this intelligence he could define the next step of the Angevin diplomacy. It was surely not an easy task to get precise and reliable information on the delicate situation in Hungary. The geographical space on one hand and the messy conditions in Hungary on the other hand raised difficulties. An illustrative example of this is at hand: on 27 January 1301 the city of Trau issued a charter under the name of King Andrew III, although the king had died nearly two weeks before.⁶⁹ On 8 March the news must have

⁶⁰ MDEA (as in footnote 2), vol. I, p. 168 (no. 212): 'Paulus Banus Croatorum pro seruitiis presentis maxime in prosecutione negotii Regni Vngarie habuit vncias auri centum annuas'.

⁶¹ MDEA (as in footnote 2), vol. I, p. 170 (no. 217).

⁶² CDCDS (as in footnote 38), vol. 7, p. 159 (no. 139).

⁶³ In his appeal on 22.06.1294, Charles II threatened the opposing nobles and prelates, declaring that an army of footmen and cavalymen would invade Hungary led by his son, Charles Martell or a general ('capitaneus') to enforce the Angevin claims in Hungary, see MDEA (as in footnote 2), vol. I, pp. 115-116 (no. 137).

⁶⁴ John, the son of *ban* Henry Kőszegi, received donations in this way, see *ibidem*, pp. 87-88 (no. 104), pp. 121-122 (no. 146); the Šubići, see *ibidem*, pp. 95-96 (no. 117), p. 124 (no. 149), p. 421 (no. 400), pp. 134-135 (no. 163); the Babonići, see *ibidem*, pp. 98-99 (no. 122), pp. 136-137 (no. 165), pp. 139-140 (no. 169), pp. 146-147 (no. 180); and the Frankopans, see *ibidem*, pp. 145-146 (no. 179).

⁶⁵ *Ibidem*, p. 120 (no. 144).

⁶⁶ *Ibidem*, p. 419 (no. 397).

⁶⁷ On the envoys in general in the Middle Ages see VOLKER SCIOR: Bemerkungen zum frühmittelalterlichen Boten- und Gesandtschaftswesen, in: WALTER POHL, VERONIKA WIESER (eds.): Der frühmittelalterliche Staat—europäische Perspektiven, Wien 2009, pp. 315-329.

⁶⁸ So did Petrus de Bonzano, the envoy of King Andrew III. We have no reason to doubt that this was a general practice at that time. See footnote 28.

⁶⁹ AOkl (as in footnote 25), vol. I, p. 46 (no. 10).

reached the city via another charter that was also issued by the city stating that: ‘the kingship is not fulfilled’.⁷⁰

During the reign of King Andrew III the connections between the royal court of Naples and Isabelle, the widow of the late king Ladislaus IV, sister of Charles II, remained intact, despite the fact that King Andrew knew that the Angevins regarded him as a usurper.⁷¹ According to the charters, a certain Cosmas⁷² and Benedict⁷³ visited Naples as envoys of Queen Isabelle and respectively a merchant from Esztergom, Gondius⁷⁴, who did trade in Apulia on behalf of Isabelle. In addition, we know of other people from Hungary in the court of the Sicilian king too: magister Nicolaus whom the king addressed as ‘clericus et familiaris noster’⁷⁵, and who was granted safe conduct to reach Hungary in safety and another Nicolaus, the provost and abbot of Arad, *familiaris* of Queen Mary⁷⁶, who studied canon-law in Naples and was generously awarded with money from the royal treasury when he was ill.⁷⁷ John, the abbot of the Cistercian monastery of Bélakút⁷⁸, envoy of Charles Martell⁷⁹, and *frater* Peter prior of the Dominicans of Kassa (Košice)⁸⁰ are only a few of the many clergymen who turned up at the royal court. These cases provided an excellent opportunity to gather some vital intelligence on the current political situation in Hungary. The gathering of information and the sequentially issued appeals to the Hungarian nobles and prelates⁸¹—carried by the above mentioned clergymen—was simply not enough to introduce the young Angevin prince’s rule in Hungary. Thus, in addition to the exchange of information, it was necessary to win the kind of supporters who not only served with news and promises but with arms and military power as well. To gain such supporters next to the Šubići other baronial families came in the

⁷⁰ Ibidem, p. 51 (no. 22).

⁷¹ ATTILA ZSOLDOS: Az Árpádok és asszonyaik [The Árpáds and Their Wives], Budapest 2005, p. 14.

⁷² MDEA (as in footnote 2), vol. 1, p. 73 (no. 88), p. 74 (no. 90), p. 131 (no. 157); regarding his identity see ZSOLDOS, Az Árpádok (as in footnote 71), p. 114.

⁷³ MDEA (as in footnote 2), vol. 1, p. 120 (no. 143).

⁷⁴ Ibidem, p. 113 (no. 134). Regarding his identity see ZSOLDOS, Az Árpádok (as in footnote 71), p. 116; GYÖRGY SZÉKELY: A székesfehérvári latinok és vallonok a középkori Magyarországon [The Latins and Vallons of Székesfehérvár in Medieval Hungary], in: ALÁN KRALOVÁNSZKY (ed.): Székesfehérvár évszázadai, vol. 2, Székesfehérvár 1972, pp. 45-72, here pp. 54-55.

⁷⁵ MDEA (as in footnote 2), vol. 1, p. 113 (no. 135).

⁷⁶ Ibidem, pp. 97-98 (no. 120).

⁷⁷ Ibidem, p. 93 (no. 117).

⁷⁸ For detailed information on his visit see MIKLÓS TAKÁCS: A bélakúti/péteváradai ciszterci monostor [The Monastery of Bélakút/Pétevárad], Újvidék 1989, pp. 32-33.

⁷⁹ MDEA (as in footnote 2), vol. 1, p. 98 (no. 121).

⁸⁰ Ibidem, p. 144 (no. 176).

⁸¹ Ibidem, p. 76 (no. 91), p. 84 (no. 101), p. 422 (no. 402).

front light of the Angevin diplomacy: the Babonići⁸², who possessed land in Croatia, and the Kőszegis⁸³, who had great influence in Slavonia, e. g.

According to the charters the number of envoys between the family of the *ban* and the Neapolitan court also increased. In regard to the above mentioned grain supplies the name of a certain Vulcatus, who was a kinsman of *ban* Paul, emerged.⁸⁴ It is quite obvious matters beyond the provisioning of Slavonian castles were discussed. The *ban* himself and his brothers visited the Neapolitan court in person. The royal family summoned Paul Šubić on 20 June 1294 before their presence to receive wise counsel in regard to the Hungarian affairs.⁸⁵ This appeal is surely connected with the donation of King Andrew III who could only achieve partial military success against the opposing barons who turned against his rule. To appease the barons the king donated land to others, including to *ban* Paul, who was granted the hereditary title of Maritime *ban* as discussed above.⁸⁶ Either way, the subsequent events reveal the practice of receiving ambassadors in the Neapolitan court. More than two weeks later, the court granted safe-conduct for all those who entered the Sicilian Kingdom as the entourage of *ban* Paul or *comes* George whether they travelled with them or separately.⁸⁷ The Šubići did not hurry with the departure: on 4 August the king sent letters to Milan and Genova to inform their government that *ban* Paul was travelling to Naples under the protection of the King of Jerusalem and Sicily.⁸⁸ This case is obviously flagrant since the two parties could not meet personally on every occasion but it indicates the personal relationship of trust that had developed between the two families. Next to granting safe-conduct the king did everything he could to ensure that the envoys or the members of the family of the *ban* arrived home in safety. It is known that a returning party received more than 40 horses and chargers from the king.⁸⁹ In cases of sea travel, galleys were provided to the ambassadors.⁹⁰

At this point we would like to draw attention to the importance of personal acquaintances. From the above mentioned baronial circle only the Kőszegis withdrew their support from the backing of the Angevins. The King of Sicily personally met the members of the Šubić, Babonić and Frankopan families. The loyalty of the Hungarian barons was already dubious before this period since the country was run by various and ever-shifting baronial leagues. The royal council and the highest offices were filled by the members of those

⁸² See footnote 66.

⁸³ *Ibidem*.

⁸⁴ CDCDS (as in footnote 38), vol. 7, pp. 127-128 (no. 108).

⁸⁵ MDEA (as in footnote 2), vol. 1, p. 114 (no. 136).

⁸⁶ SZŰCS (as in footnote 1), p. 457.

⁸⁷ CDCDS (as in footnote 38), vol. 7, p. 180 (no. 161); MDEA (as in footnote 2), vol. 1, p. 119 (no. 142).

⁸⁸ CDCDS (as in footnote 38), vol. 7, p. 181 (no. 162).

⁸⁹ *Ibidem*, p. 297 (no. 257).

⁹⁰ *Ibidem*, p. 357 (no. 310).

leagues, which means that personal changes occurred from year to year depending on the strength of the leagues.⁹¹ Merely the promise of new donations can not be linked with their change of loyalty since the sources prove that almost every baron received donations from Charles II and Andrew III as well and, they also received benefits from Wencelas. In many cases the same holdings were granted by the claimants to the barons. The nexus of Charles and Ugrinus from the genus Csák furthermore strengthens the hypothesis of the significance of personal relations. When Charles arrived in Hungary the *ban* handed him over to *magister* Ugrinus. In Ugrinus the young Angevin prince found a ward and a protector ('conservator'⁹²) although Ugrinus had been held as a prisoner back in 1292 by the members of the Angevin party since he was a stalwart supporter of King Andrew III. He gained back his freedom only after the plea of *ban* Radislaus.⁹³ The *familiars* of *magister* Ugrinus also knew Charles personally. The castle of Pozsega (Požega) was handed over to Charles's possession by Paul Garai, the son of *comes* Stephen from the genus Dorozsma, by the urge of *magister* Ugrinus. Stephen served *magister* Ugrinus too⁹⁴ and he was also the sword bearer of King Béla IV (1235-1270). According to a charter, when Charles rewarded Paul Garai's loyalty by land in 1310, his father was called as *ban* in the text of the diploma.⁹⁵ Paul, who certainly belonged to the *familia* of Ugrinus, remained loyal to Charles, and because of this and other merits he not only received land but also bore the title of *ban* of Macsó between the years 1320 and 1328.⁹⁶ A similar career was made by *magister* Beke, son of Thomas: A diploma from 1302 records that the king donated the royal village of Böszörménytelek to Beke where the king and his barons made a stay. In this charter the king tells why *magister* Beke was rewarded with this donation. He stood up for the king since he had arrived in Hungary, and he had accompanied Charles in his campaigns as well.⁹⁷

According to Gyula Kristó the majority of the barons were driven by 'firm belief, compulsion or adventurousness' when they chose sides during the conflict.⁹⁸ In our opinion, as they formed their own belief, personal relations played an important role since with a personal acquaintance the trust that developed could prove stronger than an advantage promised by a third party.

⁹¹ SZÚCS (as in footnote 1), pp. 391-404.

⁹² JÁNOS KARÁCSONYI: A magyar nemzetségek a XIV. század közepéig [The Hungarian Genera until the Mid-14th Century], Budapest 1995, p. 368.

⁹³ IMRE NAGY, ISTVÁN PAUR et al. (eds.): Hazai okmánytár. Codex diplomaticus patriae Hungaricus, vol. 7, Győr—Budapest 1880, pp. 230-231 (no. 187).

⁹⁴ KARÁCSONYI (as in footnote 92), p. 438.

⁹⁵ IMRE NAGY, GYULA NAGY (eds.): Anjoukori Okmánytár. Codex diplomaticus Andegavensis, vol. 1, Budapest 1878, pp. 195-196 (no. 179).

⁹⁶ ENGEL, Magyarország (as in footnote 34), vol. 1, p. 27.

⁹⁷ AOKI (as in footnote 25), vol. 1, p. 181 (no. 317).

⁹⁸ KRISTÓ, I. Károly király harcai (as in footnote 10), p. 297.

In addition, the charters highlight yet another curiosity: if we take a good look at the diplomas issued by the Neapolitan court, then we can see—as Mór Wertner has also pointed out⁹⁹—that the intitulation of *ban* Paul changed from the year 1295. The forms that were used before 1295, like ‘*vir fidelis*’¹⁰⁰, ‘*banus Croatiae Dalmatiaeque*’¹⁰¹ or ‘*comes Brebichensi et Spalatensi devotus nostrum*’¹⁰² became at first ‘*dilectus et fidelis consanguineus noster*’¹⁰³, then ‘*Regine consortis noster consanguineus*’¹⁰⁴ and finally the ‘*dilectus affinis consiliarius familiaris noster*’¹⁰⁵ intitulation appeared in the charters. The traces of kinship lead back to the House Árpád, therefore *ban* Paul was a distant relative of Queen Mary.¹⁰⁶ The recognition and expression of such kinship from the king was a great honour and certainly it raised the prestige of the Šubići while at the same time showing their commitment to the House of Anjou.

In the light of the above mentioned donations, material wealth and recognition of kinship, it is hardly a coincidence that the young Angevin claimant was entrusted to *comes* George, brother of the *ban*. In 1300 preparations were already made; Charles II equipped galleys that were to carry his grandson to Hungary. At this point George’s name had already been put forward as the protector of the Angevin prince. The Sicilian King appointed a certain Maraldicus¹⁰⁷ to be *prothontinus*¹⁰⁸ (captain) of the ships. For provision the king secured 150 horses, 200 *salmas* of wheat and 400 *salmas* of barley.¹⁰⁹ To cover the expenses Charles II furthermore lent 1300 ounces of gold from the Florentine Bardi bank house.¹¹⁰ Simultaneously he appealed to the Hungarian nobles and prelates, to the king and queen of Serbia, to Gregory, elected archbishop of Esztergom and of course to *ban* Paul that he had sent off his grandson to Hungary and he entrusted the young prince to their protection and wise counsel.¹¹¹ Charles travelled to Manferdonia and to Spalato accompanied by *comes* George. In the city of Spalatao the *ban* personally received him and placed the 12 year old child under the protection of the already men-

⁹⁹ MÓR WERTNER: Eine unbekannte kroatisch-schlesische Allianz. Beitrag zur Geschichte des Geschlechtes Šubić, in: Vjestnik kr. horvatsko-slavonsko-dalmatinskog zemaljskog arkiva 3 (1901), pp. 207-217, here p. 214.

¹⁰⁰ MDEA (as in footnote 2), vol. 1, pp. 85-86 (no. 102).

¹⁰¹ Ibidem, p. 95 (no. 117).

¹⁰² Ibidem, p. 100 (no. 125).

¹⁰³ Ibidem, p. 124 (no. 149), p. 134 (no. 162).

¹⁰⁴ Ibidem, p. 142 (no. 173).

¹⁰⁵ Ibidem, p. 161 (no. 202).

¹⁰⁶ WERTNER, Eine unbekannte kroatisch-schlesische Allianz (as in footnote 99), pp. 214-217.

¹⁰⁷ MDEA (as in footnote 2), vol. 1, pp. 148-149 (no. 182).

¹⁰⁸ On the interpretation of the expression see [CHARLES DU FRESNE] DU CANGE: Glossarium mediae et infimae latinitatis, vol. 6, Niort 1886, col. 542b.

¹⁰⁹ MDEA (as in footnote 2), vol. 1, p. 150 (no. 185).

¹¹⁰ Ibidem, p. 150 (no. 186).

¹¹¹ CDCDS (as in footnote 38), vol. 7, p. 367 (no. 320), p. 368 (no. 322).

tioned *magister* Ugrinus. The chronicle of Micha Madius, patrician of Spalato describes this event as follows: ‘In the year 1300 of the Lord, in August at the time of Pope Boniface, Lord Charles, the grandson of Charles, king of Sicily, arrived on galleys through the sea to Spalato, where he spent one or rather two months. After that, accompanied by ban Paul he departed from Spalato to Hungary, to seize the aforementioned kingdom for himself from the hands of King Andrew. He arrived in Zagreb, where he was handed over to magister Ugrinus.’¹¹²

Furthermore, Paul Šubić was not actively involved with the chaotic events of the Hungarian interregnum since he was preoccupied in the schemes against the city of Zara and the conquest of Bosnia which started in 1302 and lasted until 1308. Later on Charles as King of Hungary recognized the *ban*’s conquest who was at war with Venice that time apropos of his plans against Zara (Zadar). Paul Šubić never wanted to secede from the Hungarian crown; even after his successful conquest he never addressed himself as king of Bosnia, and was satisfied with the title of ‘Lord of Bosnia’ (‘dominus de Bosna’).¹¹³

On 1 May 1312 the *ban* died at the very moment when his son was negotiating peace with Venice. On his death the above cited chronicle of Micha Madius recorded the following: ‘In the year 1311 of the Lord, in March the city of Zara rebelled against the Venetian rule and submitted to ban Paul and his sons. In the next year in May the noble ban of Croatia, Paul, departed to Christ and his son Mladen followed him in his office as ban.’¹¹⁴

In conclusion we might say—using the words of Jenő Szűcs—ban Paul who ‘flew the flag of the Angevins’¹¹⁵ was a trustful supporter of Naples and he insisted on backing to Charles and the royal family until the very end. Hungarian historiography is currently grappling to reveal the reasons behind this allegiance to the Angevins and to explain that primarily the donations and the related economic interests played the main role.¹¹⁶ Other works highlight the importance of the papacy since Charles was supported by Boniface VIII and Benedict XI, and a reconciliation with the Holy See was therefore pos-

¹¹² SRHVG (as in footnote 18), vol. 3, p. 638: ‘Anno Domini MCCC. mense Augusto, tempore Bonifacii Papae, Dominus Carolus, Nepos Caroli Regis Siciliae, per mare cum galeis Spalatam applicuit, ubi per mensem vel fere duos stetit. Egre diensque de ciuitate Spalatensi, in comitatu Pauli Bani, versus Ungariam, ad usurpandum Regnum praedictum de manu Regis Andreae, venit Sagrabiam, et ibi in manibus Magistri Hugini traditur.’

¹¹³ CDCDS (as in footnote 38), vol. 7, pp. 331-336 (no. 289).

¹¹⁴ SRHVG (as in footnote 18), vol. 3, p. 639: ‘Anno Domini MCCCXI. mense Martii, civitas Iadrensis a Dominio Veneto fuit rebellata subiiciens se Dominio Pauli Bani, et suorum filiorum; et anno fequenti, mense Maii, Paulus Banus Nobilis Croatiae, obiit ad Christum; et Mladinus eius filius in Banum ordinatur.’

¹¹⁵ SZŰCS (as in footnote 1), p. 457.

¹¹⁶ *Ibidem*, p. 455.

sible with the backing of Charles.¹¹⁷ However these findings can be further connected with the detailed examination of personal networks using new methods as well. The development of computer technology cannot be on the side-line for an historian, even though there is seemingly a huge gap between the two sciences. The portrayal of data that we can obtain from sources could be quite fertile. The importance of this kind of research is pointed out by the project of the Austrian Academy of Sciences, named 'Mapping Medieval Conflict'.¹¹⁸ These methods can indicate a new direction in historical research and can lead us to new results and conclusions as well.

¹¹⁷ SALAMON (as in footnote 43), pp. 100-104.

¹¹⁸ <https://oeaw.academia.edu/MappingMedievalConflict> (02.02.2016).