

Transylvanian Places of Authentication and Ecclesiastical Intellectuals in the Middle Ages

EMŐKE GÁLFI

THIS PAPER aims to discuss the relationship between two essential ecclesiastical institutions' secular functions and the ecclesiastical intellectuals in the Middle Ages. However, prior to a detailed discussion of this relationship, the paper briefly presents the relevant literature, including the pitfalls and contradictions therein.

Although some basic studies have been published regarding the literature on the Transylvanian places of authentication (the Transylvanian chapter and the Cluj-Mănăştur [Kolozsmonostor] convent),¹ and the institution and operation of the convent may be deemed as being explored from this point of view, the literature on the Transylvanian chapter is rather incomplete and, in some cases, even inaccessible.² As Zsigmond Jakó has written a social portrait of the Cluj-Mănăştur convent,³ and Gábor Sipos has described its operation as a place of authentication,⁴ in the convent's case I shall rely mainly upon these works. However, the only monographic discussion⁵ of the institution and personnel of the Transylvanian chapter proved to be rather incomplete in comparison with the abovementioned publications. Although it contains much useful data, it still, apparently, failed to use the most recent research results,⁶ and it provides very little information on the functioning of the place of authentication. A possible explanation for these deficiencies is that a recently developed webpage (www.arcanum.hu), which contains the collection of charters of the National Archives of Hungary issued before the Battle of Mohács, was not available to the author who, while reviewing a large number of sources, failed (or had no means) to be exhaustive due exactly to this huge volume of works. Apart from the abovementioned work, it is an agreeable fact that several studies are currently ongoing, which evaluate the two places of authentication in Transylvania and their personnel, and some of the results have already been published in various places.⁷

The relevant literature describing the ecclesiastical intellectuals and, in general, the ecclesiastical society also contains major inequalities. The literature at the end of the 19th century and the beginning of the 20th century abounded in monographs and studies on the life, ecclesiastical and political activity of the bishops, and their role from a cultural history point of view, and several works of reference have been published in the last fifty years in this topic.⁸ Therefore, the role and significance of the leading class of the ecclesiastical society in Hungary may be broadly considered to be explored. However, there is only a rather scarce literature dealing with the middle class. Although specific studies have been published on the history of the chapters,⁹ we know almost nothing about the canons themselves. Two essential works have attempted to remedy these deficiencies and present the middle class of the chapters in Buda, Fehérvár, Győr, Bratislava (Pozsony)¹⁰ and Pécs,¹¹ as well as the mobility of the canons using the method of modern social history. Finally, as regards the literature on the ecclesiastical lower class, it can be stated that there are almost no data available on the clerics of chorus (*clericus chori*) and the chaplains of parish churches.¹² No monographic work has been published in this topic, and only some publications concerning the activity of certain places of authentication provide data on them, for they were frequently sent to external authentication tasks as witnesses. In summary, this would be the list of monographs and studies published that can be used in this topic.¹³

On the territory of the medieval Transylvanian Voivodate, two institutions have been established, which carried out authentication activity and continued to operate even during the modern age: the Transylvanian chapter and the Cluj-Mănăştur convent. According to the medieval tradition, going back to the 14th century, the latter one was established in the 11th century by the king, its founder being King Ladislas I (1077 to 1095).¹⁴ The archaeological excavations at the abbey, begun in the 1970's, seem to confirm this tradition; in addition, it is also supported by the fact that King Ladislas I established two monasteries for the Benedictine order, one at Sâniob (Szentjobb) in Bihar (1095), and another at Somogyvár (1091). The Benedictine monks played a major role in spreading the Christian faith, and this must have been the primary function of the Cluj-Mănăştur convent, as well.

Due to its early establishment and its status of royal abbey, the abbey of Cluj-Mănăştur was exempted from the jurisdiction of the bishop responsible for this area (that is, the bishop of Transylvania). During the 12th and 13th centuries, the bishops of Transylvania tried to eliminate this privilege, and that is why the first written accounts of Cluj-Mănăştur concern the conflicts that arose over such exemptions. The litigation between the Bishopric and the abbey in the papal court went on until the invasion of the Tatars, when reaching a sound agreement seemed to be the only way in Transylvania after such large-scale

destruction. Beginning with the second half of the 13th century, our sources no longer make reference to the contestation of the *exemptio*.

All evidence indicates that the monastery was destroyed, and even its survival was much in doubt as a result of the invasion of Tatars in 1241. Though the Bishopric of Transylvania probably made no attempt to facilitate the reorganization of the abbey, it seems that the monastery was re-established around 1280, and previous opinions, according to which the monastery was destroyed again during the invasion of Tatars in 1285, cannot be justified. The first authenticated charter, known to us, is dated September 8th, 1308. It has a rudimentary structure, and the three remains of strings on the fold indicate that, in addition to the convent's seal, it was confirmed by other seals, as well.

During the late 13th and early 14th century, only sporadic data are available on the convent due to the internal conditions in the country, and it is known that King Charles I (1308–1342) managed to gain control over the internal anarchy only at the end of the 1320s. The functioning of the convent fully reflected the national conditions, as demonstrated by the fact that the archbishop of Esztergom was forced to remove abbot Haidenricus from his position in 1311, and from that time on, his successors were not elected abbots with full rights, but appointed alternates.

Under the strong reign of King Charles I, the situation of the abbey was cleared, and the abbots tried to improve the monastery's financial situation, providing thus a sound foundation for the operation of the place of authentication. This prosperous time of the place of authentication had lasted until the middle of the 15th century. Under the reign of King Mathias, characterized by a tendency to centralize power, the king provided remuneration for those in the service of the court by giving the assets of the church under their command as payment. More and more secular officials were endowed with ecclesiastical benefits as a sign of the king's favour, who regarded these benefits just as a source of income. It was no different for Cluj-Mănăştur, where the commending abbots were usually not even in the monastery, and the abbey itself became a domain of the king to be used to award merits in the royal court. Only one part of its former role was kept unchanged, that is, being a place of authentication, which also served secular purposes.

The beginning of the 16th century was marked by a series of reform efforts within the order of St. Benedict. These efforts were led by Mathew Tolnai, chief-abbot of Pannonhalma, who tried to recover the Benedictine abbeys fallen into the hands of the laity, and ordered that the bull "Benedictina" (1336) be observed, a chapter to be held every two years, and that (apostolic) visitators to be sent to check the monasteries. The signs indicative of these reform efforts appeared in Cluj-Mănăştur in 1510, and then in 1518: the order's chapter elected a new

abbot in the person of Martin Nagyszombati, a position which he apparently declined. Despite these reform efforts, the decline of this institution continued, and it lost its position as a result of the spreading of Reformation. Nevertheless, the social demand for the activity of the places of authentication did not decline, and thus, in 1556, following the secularization of the church's assets, the management of such places was entrusted to secular officials, the so-called requisitors, while the order was dismissed.

The circumstances in which the cathedral chapter¹⁵ attached to the bishopric of Transylvania originated are still not clear. The literature usually considers that it has been established by King St. Ladislav for it also attributes the establishment of the cathedral chapters in Hungary to him. The text of the first authenticated charter issued by this chapter is known from 1231, based on a transcript dated 1280. Its structure reflects the uncertainties typical of authenticated charters not yet fully formed: the date recorded in the front, in the *promulgation*, is a rather archaic feature, found in the charters recorded in the registry of Oradea (Várad; 1209 to 1221) and the publications of the chapter in Székesfehérvár (1184 to 1232), however, after 1233 recording the date at the end of the charter became the common practice countrywide.

The earliest archives of the Transylvanian chapter were destroyed in 1241 during the invasion of Tatars, and the church burnt by them remained without a bishop for two years. The new bishop is mentioned for the first time in 1244, and its canons after 1248. The first charter, dated after the Tatar invasion, is known from 1252, in the transcript of a later fragment of a register.

In 1277, the cathedral and its chapter were hard hit again: Gaan, the son of *comes* Alard arrived from Ocna Sibiului (Vizakna), attacked the bishopric to revenge the death of his father and burnt down the city, including the cathedral, the chapter and those who have sought refuge there. A report of the archbishop of Kalocsa from 1309 indicated that the church's equipment, books and probably the archives were destroyed again by that date. After this last destruction, a relatively peaceful period followed in the life of the chapter. Larger scale destruction occurred once again after the secularization in 1556 and 1557 (during a transitory phase of the formation of the Principality), after the chapter had been scattered, when the archives of the place of authentication remained derelict and issuance of charters was suspended for a longer period of time.

Until the secularization in 1556 and 1557, the charter issuance activity of the two Transylvanian places of authentication had remained largely unchanged and in accordance with the Hungarian practice adopted in the Middle Ages. After the assembly of the Transylvanian Diet (*Comitia Regni*) held in 1557, these institutions started to develop along different paths, when custody of the archives

at the places of authentication was assumed by “outstanding nobleman”, that is, “requisitors” or “document searchers”.¹⁶

The study of the personnel and intellectuals of these two places of authentication raises the following question: should this class be called the order of ecclesiastical intellectuals during the entire Middle Ages, or they were, in fact, secular intellectuals at the end of this period?

In order to answer this question, I shall start by describing what the notion of “intellectuals” (*intelligentsia*) meant in the Middle Ages. In his major work on legal intellectuals, György Bónis provides the following definition of this class: “By legal scholars I refer to those who, in addition to the knowledge of arts (*artes*), have mastered the science of Roman law and canonical or domestic law at a university or in practice, who used this knowledge in their activity in politics, diplomacy, justice, contract transactions or administration, and earned their living or eventually made their fortune as lawyers or officials.”¹⁷ Apart from this, we can state that, in general, in the Middle Ages the term “intellectuals” referred to those who were professionally engaged in intellectual activities and earned their living with such activities. To put it simply, a distinction between secular or ecclesiastical intellectuals can be made, depending on whether they were working in secular or ecclesiastical institutions, but the reality was much more diversified.

Zsigmond Jakó makes the following remarks on the intellectuals in the Middle Ages in one of his major studies: “There is no other product during the feudal period, which is of such great importance for the development of the European society and culture, as the division of this traditional group into intellectuals and clergy.”¹⁸ This division, and the secularization of the ecclesiastical intellectuals, started everywhere within the order of ecclesiastical intellectuals, and the evolution of the lay intellectuals was closely intertwined with the intellectuals of the clerical society for a long time. That is the reason why the abovementioned author includes those who formally had an ecclesiastical status in the class of secular intellectuals, and who held secular intellectual posts and their career was facilitated by activities carried out in the benefit of the secular society.¹⁹

The spread of the use of written legal evidence, and an increased demand for the issuance of charters by the places of authentication made it necessary for the secular priests to adapt their culture to the requirements of the secular society. In the medieval Catholic church, the majority of the qualified secular priests had no theological studies, (and the majority of) the clerics mastered the secular subject matters of the seven liberal arts based on antique traditions.²⁰ The education of such qualified clerics enabled them to carry out intellectual activities, and from this point of view it did not matter that these activities were conducted within the church or the secular society.

This group of the elite ecclesiastical intellectuals, which is clearly distinct from the monastic order, carried out political and diplomatic tasks on behalf of the court and was granted titles of high priest and ecclesiastical benefice for its secular services. This category included all Transylvanian bishops in the 16th century,²¹ who graduated from university, with only two exceptions. There are no data available on Francis Perényi²² (1508 to 1514), although his well-known humanistic education indicates the likelihood that he had some kind of university degree. Similarly, though we have no information on his university studies, John Statileo was highly proficient in Latin.²³ Very often a group of humanists formed around the bishop²⁴ (as it was the case of Ladislás Geréb and Francis Várdai), the members of which were also diplomats of the court.

Based on a similar mechanism, the middle class of secular clergy became the beneficiary of canonical stallums and richer parishes. Due to an increase in the number of its members, at the end of the 14th century this middle class resented that foreigners were granted benefices in Hungary, and after a century, even native educated clerics had difficulties in finding a post. In an attempt to solve this problem, the simultaneous possession of several benefices was prohibited.²⁵

Starting with the beginning of the 15th century, the increase in the size of the ecclesiastical middle class was associated with an increase in the general education of its members. While at the beginning of the 14th century it was considered sufficient if a future canon was able to read, at the end of the century one was required to speak, write and read in Latin.²⁶ In the 15th century, though not mandatory, a university degree proved helpful in gaining a benefice to which the middle class was possibly entitled.²⁷

The university degree has not been included in any of the chapter statutes, but this option may have been exercised even during holding the post of canon, which also provided exemption from the obligation of permanent residence. The chapters often covered the costs of studies by donating canonical stallums in the hope that they would get in exchange qualified personnel for the authentication activity or the management of economic and legal affairs of the chapter. Consequently, even if the statutes did not require a university degree, the chapters endeavoured to have personnel with such degree, as well.

The contradiction between the lay education of the secular clergy and its clerical nature was solved by the Reformation. Some priests were assimilated in the order of protestant priests, while others became secular intellectuals.

Another group of the ecclesiastical intellectuals, distinct from the secular clergy, was represented by the monastic communities, in this case, in particular, the intellectuals of the Benedictine order.²⁸ Within this order, there was a great gulf between an abbot managing a monastery and the simple monks living in that monastery. The abbot had control over the assets and estates, and used only as

much of the income from his properties as absolutely necessary for the sustenance of the monks, the latter being dependent on the abbot, who exercised even disciplinary power over them.

This difference between the head of the convent and the monks was even more conspicuous in cases where the monastery was headed not by an abbot, but a governor or a lay commander. Though some of the monks stood out from the rest, due to their mandates or offices (in particular, a *prior*, *custos*, or *cantor*), such positions were usually only temporary, and did not lead to the development of a more privileged group.

As regards intellectual proficiency, the members of the monastery were less educated than the begging friars, but still they were able to carry out their educational mission conferred on them by the church in the Middle Ages. Although they did not represent the most progressive form of ecclesiastical education, they still had a great influence through their frequent contacts with the public and its problems during their authentication activity. There were no leading scientists or famous humanists among the convent members; however, they played a major educational role through the spreading of literacy and written practices in Transylvania.

In summary, it can be concluded that the proper ecclesiastical intellectuals were in the monastic orders both in Transylvania and Hungary, while those members of the chapters who assumed secular intellectual posts, the secular clergy included, were in fact secular intellectuals in clerical gowns.

A closer study of the intellectuals of the two abovementioned places of authentication makes it necessary to describe the structure of the institutions that employed them.

As regards the number of its members, the Transylvanian chapter was a middle-sized one, since in the 14th century it had 24 canonical stallums, while in 1496 this number reached 27.²⁹ In comparison, Esztergom or Veszprém had 39 or 36 canons, respectively, (to mention only the largest ones); at the other extreme, Nitra (Nyitra) or Kalocsa had 12 (in the 15th century) or 10 canonical stallums, respectively.³⁰

The classical structure of the Hungarian cathedral chapters and collegiate chapters was as follows: provost, lector, cantor and custos, sub-provost (if a collegiate chapter functioned near the cathedral chapter) and, finally, master canon. The archdeacons of dioceses had also such canonical stallums, in Transylvania thirteen in total. We would have a more precise picture of the members of these chapters if their statutes would still exist, but besides the statutes of Zagreb (Zágráb; 1334)³¹ and Oradea (1374),³² we know only of the Collection of Acts of the collegiate chapter in Dealul Orăzii (Váradhegyfok),³³ written between 1495 and 1497, and the Protocol on Church Visitation³⁴ of the church in Esztergom,

dated 1397, to which all customs were added that had already been in use up to that time. Finally, we also know of a fragment of the statute of the chapter in Bratislava, dated 1521.³⁵

Although the Transylvanian chapter most certainly had statutes (as indicated by the list of tithes dated 1504³⁶), these are no longer available to us, and thus only the lines on dignitaries in the privilege charters, the chapters' list of tithes³⁷ and personal data of some canons give us an idea about these bodies in the 16th century (and for the entire period of the Middle Ages). The lines on dignitaries in the charters issued by the places of authentication usually specify the *dignitarius*, that is, the dignitaries, which included the lector, the cantor and the *custos*. This is a classical model, but the lines on dignitaries of different chapters may vary more or less depending on their customs: thus the publications of the place of authentication in Pécs specify the sub-provost, as well,³⁸ while the charters of the chapter in Arad exclude the provost, and specify the master canons present at that time, as well.³⁹

With one exception,⁴⁰ the lines on dignitaries used by the Transylvanian chapter during the Middle Ages usually specify the provost, the cantor, the custos and the dean,⁴¹ and consistently ignore the lector, which suggests that this honour, even if it originally existed in the Transylvanian chapter, ceased to exist within a short time. According to Géza Hegyi, the post of lector was eliminated at the end of the 13th century as a result of the breakdown of community life, and the associated duties were divided between the schoolmaster (*scolasticus*) and the notary (*notarius*), whose fees together did not amount to the remuneration of the lector.⁴² The partial transfer of this post is demonstrated by the fact that during the allocation of the tithes, the schoolmaster has been listed many times among the other dignitaries of the chapter, and its share of each item was frequently similar to that of the cantor, the custos or the dean.⁴³

In his study on the protocol of the chapter in Buda, dated in the late period of the Middle Ages, András Kubinyi⁴⁴ pointed out that the lines on dignitaries written nearly at the same time specified the same names, which can be explained by authoritarianism according to the author.

Thus, the abovementioned dignitaries and deans were the most prominent members of the Transylvanian chapter. If we take into account that, based on the chapter's list of tithes⁴⁵, the persons mentioned in these lines on dignitaries received an entire share for canon, in addition to their regular fees, we have no reason to doubt the above statement. Though the lion's share of the work was not carried out by them, the data available suggest that the reports were recorded not only in the presence of simple master canons, but also of the chapter's dignitaries.⁴⁶

During the legal (preparatory) phase of the work carried out at the place of authentication of the Transylvanian chapter, the declarations (*fassio*) were recorded

and the administrative orders were implemented by the members of the chapter, however, the roles were clearly separated as regards the so-called external and internal works. While it seems that recording of declarations and sealing of charters have been carried out exclusively in the presence of canons, at the beginning of the 16th century the Transylvanian chapter's canonical body, unlike other bodies, carried out almost no external authentication activity, a member of the ecclesiastical lower class, usually a *rector altarum* being almost always designated for such assignments.

As we mentioned in the section on research history of this paper, the institution and the social portrait of the convent of Cluj-Mănăştur, including the intellectuals, may be considered to be already processed,⁴⁷ therefore we shall describe only in outline the structure of the convent and the work done by the monks (nevertheless, we processed the convent's publications on the authentication activity for seven years, as well⁴⁸). In his basic work, Zsigmond Jakó has dealt separately with those employees of the place of authentication who performed notary functions,⁴⁹ and his data clearly shows that these functions were mostly secular functions during the Middle Ages, and therefore, similarly to the chapter's notaries, this paper shall not address their persons and activities.

The abbots, governors, commanders and landstewards constituted a clearly separate group within the convent, and though many of them were members of the ecclesiastical intellectuals, they did not take part in the authentication activity during the period concerned, so this paper shall not cover this group.

From a social history point of view, two groups of monks living within the walls of the monastery formed a closed unit: the ordained priests and the simple lay friars. Among them, similarly to the ecclesiastical lower order of the Transylvanian chapter, only the names of those are known today who contributed to the authentication activity as delegated witnesses. Based on their work, they were probably the most educated residents in the monastery: they could write and knew Latin, as demonstrated by the ad-hoc records made on-site, on the backside of the mandates. In most cases they were not simple friars, but ordained priests and presbyters (again, similarly to the ecclesiastical lower order of the Transylvanian chapter).⁵⁰

There are no accurate data on the number of the convent's personnel, but this number was probably maximum 12 and minimum 7 or 8. As these data refer almost exclusively to the monks who carried out authentication tasks, the existence of only four or five friars can be demonstrated, but it is known that the convent has always sent the more educated and imposing members as commissioners. Though the monks constituted a unit closed to the outside world, there was no brotherly equality among the convent's members as required by the regulations. Some members received functions due to their distinguished

origin or their merits, which provided them with a more favourable position compared to others.

As in the convent of Cluj-Mănăştur, it was not usual to specify the list of functionaries in the privilege charters with pendant seals (cf. lines on dignitaries in the privilege charters of the Transylvanian chapter), the names of the persons in the abovementioned functions were mentioned only incidentally in the convent's charters. Of the functions existing in the Benedictine convents, only the *prior*, the *custos* and the *cantor* is used by the convent of Cluj-Mănăştur.⁵¹ In addition to the functionaries and ordained priests of the convent, the monastic community also included subdeacons and deacons (*subdiaconi* and *diaconi*), who were the altar servers (*acolyti*) covering the lower ecclesiastical orders. The personnel of the monastery included clerics of chorus (*clerici chori*) or monastery priests (*clerici monasterii*), whose title of *magister* suggests that they were educated priests who entered a monastery but have never professed themselves in an order.

It is rather difficult to draw conclusions about the origins of the convent members due to the fact that in most cases the family name is missing. The Benedictine monasteries in Hungary recruited most of their members from the classes below the nobility, and did not provide major advancement in the social hierarchy, but ensured a safe living and carefree life for their monks. The children of lower rank noble families or wealthier urban citizens also joined the Benedictine order, for it provided a better chance for social advancement (and helping their relatives.) Similarly to other monasteries, in the case of the convent of Cluj-Mănăştur it can be assumed that most of the members came from the surrounding communities (Cluj [Kolozvár], Cluj-Mănăştur, Dej [Dés], Turda [Torda]) and the northern part of Transylvania.

The study of the convent's publications demonstrate that, in addition to their utmost accuracy, there is not much information to be added to the data based on the protocols of the place of authentication, processed by Zsigmond Jakó. We did not manage to find any other member of this place of authentication whose name is not also mentioned in the protocols. Nevertheless, these publications differ from the materials of the protocols in that they include a greater number of documents on the external authentication activity, and thus provide a more detailed picture on the delegated persons and their activities.

The reports included in these publications show that, unlike the chapter, this convent almost never sent witnesses from the ecclesiastical lower order. Except for a few cases, these witnesses were all ordained priests⁵² who professed themselves in the highest order (the term *sacerdos* or *presbiter* is mentioned next to their names) and their title was *religiosus vir*. If, however, they abandoned this practice, it was because of the high workload on the place of authentication (similarly to the chapter), as it was usually the case before judicial days. In these cases they sent

notaries or scribes, as well,⁵³ and in such cases we have the possibility to learn about some members whose identity remained unrevealed up to that time. Due to its many tasks, the convent sometimes needed to employ two notaries, but it is true that the data available refer to only one year,⁵⁴ and further sources would be needed to determine whether this was an isolated event or a frequent phenomenon. As in the case of the Transylvanian chapter, the convent also had its skilled members who were sent to carry out the on-site external activities.

Taking into account the above, the following question raises: why did the convent send in almost all cases monks who represented a more educated group to carry out external activities, while the Transylvanian chapter employed only members of the ecclesiastical lower order for this purpose? As regards the monks' education, it can be stated that the monks taking part in the authentication activity could read and write in Latin, and were probably well-skilled in the practice of law and administration. The Benedictine order did not impose particularly demanding requirements for the education of the monks, and it is a fact that the monastery schools of the Benedictine order, as compared to the schools of chapters have remained on the level of the early Middle Ages. The apprentices were taught to chant, sing, keep masses and other tasks related to the liturgical rites by a few experienced monks, and no special teachers were involved in this activity. The Reform Statute dated 1336 required that the applicants be taught Latin, logics and philosophy, and that the more talented apprentices be sent to university at the order's expense, but there are no indications that these provisions were observed by the Hungarian Benedictine order.⁵⁵

As a result of the fact that the Benedictine order failed to provide modern education to its members, the order lost its attractiveness for those who wanted to learn and to advance due to their education. This order was unable and did not want to create conditions favourable for learning and education for its members, and therefore, the prominent educational role of the monastic community had shrunk during this late and declining stage of the convent's existence compared to the period prior to the 14th century.

As regards the members of the chapter, it can be stated that the middle and upper groups professed the most progressive ideas of that time, and that even the lower order had the appropriate level of knowledge to carry out the activities presented inside the chapter. Therefore, it can be assumed that these two groups (the lower order of the chapter and the upper group of the convent's monks) had an almost identical level of knowledge.



Notes

1. The most important studies are, including but not limited to, the following: Zsigmond Jakó, ed., *A kolozsmonostori konvent jegyzőkönyvei 1289–1556* (The convent records from Cluj-Mănăştur, 1289–1556), *A Magyar Országos Levéltár kiadványai*, II, Forráskiadványok, no. 17 (2 vols., Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1990; henceforth: *KmJkv*); Gábor Sipos, “A kolozsmonostori konvent hiteleshelyi működése” (The activity of the convent of Cluj-Mănăştur as a place of authentication), in *Művelődéstörténeti tanulmányok* (Studies in cultural history), eds. Elek Csetri, Zsigmond Jakó and Sándor Tonk (Bucharest: Kriterion, 1979), 33–50; Antal Beke, ed., *Az erdélyi káptalan levéltára Gyulafehérvárt* (The archive of the Transylvanian chapter in Alba Iulia) 1889–1895, off-print of the corresponding volumes of the *Történelmi Tár* 12–16 (1889–1893); Remig Békefi, *A káptalani iskolák története Magyarországon 1540-ig* (The history of the chapter-schools in Hungary until 1540) (Budapest: Magyar Tudományos Akadémia, 1910).
2. In particular, we refer here to a single monographic discussion of this topic: Károly Vekov, *Locul de adevărire din Alba Iulia (secolele XIII–XVI.)* (The place of authentication from Alba Iulia. 13th–16th centuries) (Cluj-Napoca: Fundația Culturală Română and Casa de Editură și Tipografie Gloria, 2003).
3. *KmJkv*, vol. 1, 93–131.
4. Sipos, “A kolozsmonostori konvent,” 33–50.
5. Vekov, *Locul de adevărire*.
6. Vekov, *Locul de adevărire*. Though the basic work by Köblös on the ecclesiastical middle order appears in the References section (439) (cf. footnote 9), there is no sign of it in the final version of this work, and a modern discussion on the activity of the place of authentication in Pécs, published by László Koszta in 1998, contains no references to the abovementioned work, to mention only the most important ones.
7. Bálint Lakatos, “Az erdélyi káptalan és a püspöki udvar tagjai görbe tükörben. Történeti bejegyzések Pelei Tamás főesperes Erasmus kötetében (1515–1530 k.)” (The members of the Transylvanian chapter and of the Bishop’s court in curved mirror [1515–1530]), *Fons* 16 (2009): 431–470; Géza Hegyi, “Az erdélyi dékánkanonoki tisztség betöltése az Árpád- és Anjou-korban” (The election of the deans in the Transylvanian Chapter during the period of the Arpadians and Angevins), in *Középkortörténeti tanulmányok 6. A VI. Medieviztikai PhD-konferencia előadásai* (Studies in medieval history: The proceedings of the 6th Ph.D.-conference in medievalistics), eds. Péter G. Tóth and Pál Szabó (Szeged: Szegedi Középkorász Műhely, 2010); Zsolt Bogdándi, “A kolozsmonostori konvent fejedelemség kori levélkeresői” (The requisitors of the Cluj-Mănăştur convent in the age of the Principality), *Erdélyi Múzeum* 72, no. 3–4 (2010): 43–72.
8. Vilmos Fraknoi, *Bakócz Tamás élete* (The life of Thomas Bakócz), *Magyar Történelmi Életrajzok* (Budapest: Méhner Vilmos kiadása, 1889); Pál Tóth Szabó, *Szatmári György prímás* (Archbishop György Szatmári), *Magyar Történelmi Életrajzok* (Budapest: Magyar Történelmi Társulat, 1906); Vince Bunyitay, *A váradi püspökség története* (The

- history of the bishopric from Oradea) (4 vols., Oradea, Debrecen: no publisher, 1883–1935); János Temesváry, *Erdély középkori püspökei* (The Transylvanian bishops during the Middle Ages) (Cluj-Napoca: Minerva, 1922); Kálmán Juhász, *A csanádi püspökség története* (The history of the bishopric from Csanád) (7 vols., Makó: Csanád vármegye közönsége, 1930–1947); Erik Fügedi: “A XV. századi magyar püspökök” (The Hungarian bishops of the 15th century), *Történelmi Szemle* 8 (1965): 477–498; Elemér Mályusz, *Egyházi társadalom a középkori Magyarországon* (The ecclesiastical society in medieval Hungary) (Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1971).
9. Koloman Juhász, *Die Stifte der Tschanader Diözese im Mittelalter* (Münster: Aschendorff, 1927); Kálmán Juhász, *A csanádi székeskáptalan a középkorban (1030–1552)* (The cathedral chapter from Csanád in the Middle Ages), Csanádvármegyei könyvtár, 38 (Makó, 1941); Ferenc Kollányi, *Esztergomi kanonokok 1100–1900* (Canons of Esztergom 1100–1900) (Esztergom: Esztergomi Főszékesegyházi Káptalan, 1900); József Vágner, *Adalékok a nyitrai székeskáptalan történetéhez* (Considerations on the history of the cathedral chapter from Nitra) (Nitra, 1896); Pál Winkler, *A kalocsai és bácsi főkáptalan története alapításától 1935-ig* (The history of the cathedral chapters from Kalocsa and Bács from beginnings until 1935) (Kalocsa: Árpád Részvénytársaság nyomdája, 1935).
 10. Tamás Fedeles, *A pécsi székeskáptalan személyi összetétele a késő középkorban (1354–1526)* (The members of the cathedral chapter from Pécs in the Late Middle Ages), *Tanulmányok Pécs történetéből* no. 17. (Pécs: Pécs Története Alapítvány, 2005).
 11. József Köblös, *Az egyházi középréteg Mátyás és a Jagellók korában* (The ecclesiastical middle class in the age of King Matthias and the Jagellonians), *Társadalom és művelődéstörténeti tanulmányok* no. 12 (Budapest: MTA Történettudományi Intézet, 1994).
 12. Ferenc Kollányi, *A magyar katolikus alsópapság végrendelkezési joga* (The last will legislation of the Hungarian lower clergy) (Esztergom: 1890); László Koszta, “Adalékok a székesegyházi alsópapság XIII–XIV. századi történetéhez” (Considerations on the history of the ecclesiastical lower class in the 13th–14th century), *Acta Universitatis Szegediensis de Attila József Nominatae: Acta Historica* 86 (1988): 15–26.
 13. On the bibliography see Köblös, “Egyházi középréteg,” 7, 89–98.
 14. Sipos, “A kolozsmonostori konvent,” 34; *KmJkv*, vol. 1, 19–25.
 15. Zsolt Bogdándi and Emőke Gálfi, eds., *Az erdélyi káptalan jegyzőkönyvei 1222–1599*. (The protocols of the Transylvanian chapter 1222–1599) (Cluj-Napoca: Erdélyi Múzeum-Egyesület, 2006), 10, <http://mek.oszk.hu/07700/07766/index.phtml>
 16. Sándor Szilágyi, ed., *Erdélyi országgyűlési emlékek (Monumenta comitialia regni Transsylvaniae)* (Budapest: A M. T. Akadémia Könyvkiadó-hivatala, 1877), vol. 2, 81, 89, 107, 176, 340; Zsolt Trócsányi, *Törvényalkotás az Erdélyi Fejedelemségben* (Codification in the Transylvanian Principality) (Budapest: Gondolat, 2005), 212–215.
 17. György Bónis, *A jogtudó értelmiség a Mohács előtti Magyarországon* (The legal intellectuals in Hungary before Mohács) (Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1971), 11.
 18. Zsigmond Jakó, “Az erdélyi értelmiség kialakulásának kezdetei” (The Beginnings of the formation of Transylvanian intelligentsia), in *Írás, könyv, értelmiség* (Writing, books, intelligentsia), ed. Zsigmond Jakó (Bucharest: Kriterion, 1976), 10.

19. Jakó, “Az erdélyi értelmiség,” 10, 17–18.
20. Sándor Tonk, *Erdélyiek egyetemjárása a középkorban* (Academic peregrination of the Transylvanians in the Middle Ages) (Bucharest: Kriterion Könyvkiadó, 1979), 94–96.
21. The following names speak for themselves: Ladislav Geréb (1476–1501), Dominic Kálmáncsehi (1501), Nicholas Bácskai (1502–1504), Sigismund Thurzó (1504–1506), Francis Perényi (1508–1514), Francis Várdai (1514–1524), John Gosztonyi (1524–1527), John Statileo (1528–1542).
22. Bunyitay, “A váradi püspökség,” 367–377.
23. Bónis, “Jogtudó értelmiség,” 322.
24. Jolán Balogh, *Az erdélyi renaissance* (The Renaissance in Transylvania) (Cluj-Napoca: Erdélyi Tudományos Intézet, 1943), 51–52, 64–67, 90–93.
25. Elemér Mályusz, *A konstanzi zsinat és a magyar főkegyúri jog* (The Council of Konstanz and the Hungarian patronate law), *Értekezések a történeti tudományok köréből: Új sorozat*, no. 9 (Budapest: Akadémiai, 1958), 75–84, 123–131.
26. Mályusz, “A konstanzi zsinat,” 104–110.
27. Köblös, “Egyházi közélet,” 37–46.
28. *KmJkv*, vol. 1, 93–131.
29. Mályusz, “Egyházi társadalom,” 117.
30. Fedeles, “A pécsi székeskáptalan,” 48–49.
31. I. K. Tkalčić, ed., *Monumenta historica episcopatus Zagrabiensis*, vol. 2 (Zagreb: Car. Albrecht, 1874), 1–149.
32. Vince Bunyitay, *A váradi káptalan legrégebbi statutumai* (The Oldest Statutes of the Chapter from Oradea) (Oradea: Franklin-Társulat nyomdája, 1886).
33. Vince Bunyitay, “Szent László sírjának káptalana Váradon” (The Chapter of the Grave of King St. Ladislav in Oradea), *Történelmi Tár* 2 (1879): 181–186.
34. Ferenc Kollányi, “Visitatio Capituli e. m. Strigoniensis anno 1397,” *Történelmi Tár* 24 (1901): 73–106, 239–272, 243.
35. Nándor Knauz, “Balbi Jeromos, II. Lajos király tanára” (The teacher of King Louis II, Jerome Balbi), *Magyar Sion* (1886): 246–261, 321–327.
36. National Archives of Hungary (Magyar Országos Levéltár), Budapest (henceforth: Nat. Arch. Hung.), Collection of pre-1526 charters, Photocopies (Diplomatikai Fényképgyűjtemény; henceforth: DF), 277689: fol. 5^v. “iuxta capitulare decretum”.
37. Samu Barabás, “Erdélyi káptalani tizedlajstromok. Huszti András levele” (The tithe registers of the Transylvanian chapter. The letter of András Huszti), *Történelmi Tár* 34 (1911): 401–442; DF 277689.
38. Fedeles, “A pécsi székeskáptalan,” 57–59.
39. Nat. Arch. Hung., Collection of pre-1526 charters (Diplomatikai Levéltár, henceforth: DL), 36349. 110^r. no. 1, 110^v. no. 1–2.
40. In 1286 a lector called Tomas is mentioned. Zsigmond Jakó, ed., *Codex diplomaticus Transsylvaniae: Diplomata, epistolae et alia instrumenta litteraria res Transylvanas illustrantia. Erdélyi okmánytár: Oklevelek, levelek és más írásos emlékek Erdély történetéhez*, vol. 1 (1023–1300), vol. 2 (1301–1339), vol. 3 (1340–1359), A Magyar Országos Levéltár Kiadványai, II, Forráskiadványok, no. 26, 40, 47 (3 vols., Budapest: Akadémiai

- Kiadó and Magyar Országos Levéltár, 1997–2008; henceforth: *CDTrans*), vol. 1, no. 422.
41. The dean in medieval Hungary was not a *dignitarius* as it was in other European chapters. Although the dean was elected annually, its place in the lines of dignitaries and the account of incomes places this office close to the dignitaries.
 42. Géza Hegyi, *Az erdélyi káptalan Árpád- és Anjou-kori személyzete* (The members of the Transylvanian chapter in the age of the Arpadians and Angevins) (manuscript, 2008).
 43. DF 277689; Barabás, “Tizedlajstromok,” 401–442.
 44. András Kubinyi–Erik Fügedi, “A budai káptalan jegyzőkönyve” (The register of the chapter from Buda) *Történeti statisztikai évkönyv 1967–1968* (Budapest: Központi Statisztikai Hivatal Könyvtára, Országos Levéltár, 1970), 20.
 45. Barabás, “Tizedlajstromok,” 401–442.
 46. DL 29315; Beke, “Az erdélyi káptalan,” no. 812.
 47. Cf. footnotes 3 and 4.
 48. DL 26471–27792 (1500–1507).
 49. *KmJkv*, vol. 1, 120–131.
 50. Their list: *KmJkv*, vol. 1, 96–101.
 51. *KmJkv*, vol. 1, 111–120.
 52. This also complied with the laws in force, see Georgius Bónis and Vera Bácskai, eds., *Decreta Regni Hungariae. Gesetze und Verordnungen Ungarns 1301–1457* (Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1976), 268.
 53. January 4th, 1501: presbyter Martin, convent’s notary (DL 28665); July 10th, 1504: scribe Sebestyén, convent’s notary (DL 28669); December 28th, 1504: scribe Thomas (*scriba*) (DL 27105).
 54. Two accounts from 1500 (DL 26474, 27232), which mention two notaries: scribe Sebestyén on October 31st and notary Martin on December 31st. Since we know that Sebastian Kesztlöci assumed the post of notary until 1521, we may conclude that these two notaries worked at the same time.
 55. Mályusz, “Egyházi társadalom,” 246–247.

Abstract

Transylvanian Places of Authentication and Ecclesiastical Intellectuals in the Middle Ages

This study's aim is to discuss the relationship between two essential ecclesiastical institutions' secular functions and the ecclesiastical intellectuals in the Middle Ages. The paper starts with some considerations on the bibliography related to this topic, focusing on the pitfalls and contradictions therein. After the short presentation of the medieval history of the Convent of Cluj-Mănăştur and of the Transylvanian chapter the author tries to answer a fundamental question about the personnel of these places of authentication: can this social strata be called ecclesiastical intelligentsia during all the Middle Ages, or, towards the end of this period we could rather consider them secular intellectuals? The conclusion is that the proper ecclesiastical intellectuals were in the monastic orders both in Transylvania and Hungary, while those members of the chapters who assumed secular intellectual posts, the secular clergy included, were in fact secular intellectuals in clerical gowns.

Keywords

Transylvania, Middle Ages, places of authentication, intellectuals, clergy