

Greek Monks¹ As Latin Bishops in the Kingdom of Hungary and in Transylvania (11th–12th Centuries)

ȘERBAN TURCUȘ

An Anthroponymic Contribution

It is therefore impossible to speak about an anthroponymic uniformity or about ethnic homogeneity.

Șerban Turcuș

Associate professor at the Faculty of History and Philosophy, Babeș-Bolyai University. Author, among other titles, of the vol. **Saint Gerard of Cenad or The Destiny of a Venetian around the Year One Thousand** (2006).

ONE OF the most sensitive areas of onomatology in the medieval era, regarding the anthroponymic dimension, is the part reserved to the names of the clergy. It is significant because it finely detects the impulses coming from the area controlled by the Church, both Roman and Byzantine. It is known that the Latin Church started, in the 11th century, an active process of sanctification of every aspect of common life as a prolific anticipation of the afterlife. The entry into the Christian community marked by the sacrament of baptism and the consequent institutional assertion of the name became the cardinal moment where the redeeming mission of the Church begins. And

Article financed through CNCISIS, IDEI program, code ID_2348, “Anthroponymy in Medieval Transylvania (11th–14th Centuries): Statistical Evaluation, Evolution, Significance.”

since many of the noble families or those from the rural elite had a clear projection on what the future held for their offspring in a social and religious context excessively dominated by the people of the Church (we are in full hierocratic swing)—to quote Jacques Le Goff—it so happens that many of names belonging to European clergymen or those of Greek-Latin culture are significant for the path which Christian onomatology, Roman or Byzantine, takes. Although 11th and 12th century Transylvania holds a modest position in the context of a global unity that encompassed the political and religious structures (*Christianitas*), even here the continental trend regarding the anthroponyms can be identified in the ecclesiastical field. It is without a doubt that the Kingdom of Hungary (we refer here to the institutional structure, to simplify the discourse; in fact the Kingdom of Hungary remained for many years a tribal federation, structuring itself for two centuries), in its slow, tiresome and obsessive extension towards the *terra ultrasilvana*, is an onomastic web where you can hardly distinguish any functional anthroponymic norms, except for those existing within the bi-ritual Church operating on a territory only vaguely controlled by the royal power. But the “Hungarian Church,” both the extra-Transylvanian and the Transylvanian one, is made of characters that are ethnically different from the population that produced the king and the whole Hungarian royal dynasty. It is known that for at least three centuries most of the clergy in the Hungarian patrimonial kingdom were foreigners, and did not share the common destiny of the Hungarians, being either representatives of Rome, or being raised, educated and still attached to Constantinople, or even representing the tribal political factions or just simple people seeing to their own interests (especially in the second half of the 13th century). Ethnically speaking, the first clerical figures of the proto-Christian or of the early Christian history of Hungarian Pannonia are of Greek or Slavic descent and also of Eastern rite. This is one of the ethnic sources which would survive in the Hungarian Church. The second source is the pro-Latin clergy coming either from the area around the Italian peninsula or from northern France, and occasionally from the Iberian peninsula.² Third come the mainly German-speaking clergymen from the empire. The other high-ranking and medium level clergymen are Hungarian. So, if we analyze the clerical onomatology, we get find ourselves in a multiethnic area where Hungarians were a minority. We limited ourselves to the diplomatic documents regarding Transylvania, such as they were academically described in *Documente privind istoria României* (Documents concerning Romanian history, series C, Transylvania, volume 1), with the caveat that some documents are suspected of being partial forgeries, a circumstance which affects only to a small degree the anthroponymic dimension and mostly the toponymic and especially the judicial one.

One of the first observations we have to make regarding the clerical anthroponymy, especially that of the bishops, is that the rather small number of Hungarians who rise to that position is mostly due to the limited evangelization of the kingdom ruled by the Árpád monarchs. This is also proven by the poor legislation promoted by the Hungarian kings and the progress made by the Gregorian reform. In this particular situation, the anthroponymic consequences of all these elements appear late in the 12th century, and we notice that in the 13th century, during the rule of Ladislaus IV the Cuman and at the time of the General Synod in Buda (1279), the basic elements of a hierocracy along Gregorian lines had not been implemented within the Kingdom of Hungary, in spite of the previous attempts. The most notable of them, in the 12th century, was the provincial council of Esztergom, from the beginning of 1114, which elaborated and approved 65 canons, a *corpus* which was meant to be an actual code of religious life in Hungary. Many of the council's decisions deal mainly with the problems of the clergy, seeking to elevate their intellectual and moral standards. The consecration of ignorant priests was forbidden, and if those priests were already consecrated, they were to be either instructed or deposed; the canons were required to speak Latin in the canonic residence, the law of ecclesiastic celibacy was proclaimed, but with some reservations, explained by the fact that the Arpadian Kingdom had only recently joined the Christian community. Therefore, the canon 31, taking into account human weakness, allowed priests who had married previous to their consecration to keep their wives, but denied marriage to those who were consecrated as priests or deacons without being married. In the event a bishop was married, he had to ask for his wife's consent prior to accepting the title, the latter not being able to live in the bishop's residence, in a direct implication of the practice of chastity. If marriage was tolerated for the priests, a relationship out of wedlock was forbidden; the penalty of defrocking was specified for those priests who married twice or for those who married for the first time a widow or a person they seduced. Only the Angevin administrative-institutional shift of paradigm managed to structure the society of the Kingdom of Hungary into something resembling its Western neighbors. Here we must place an element which is obscured quite well by our neighboring country's historiography and ignored or invalidated by ours: the existence of a Greek rite clergy, sometimes even obedient to Constantinople. Amid the frantic rhythm of the last century and its insensitive consequential rationalizations we have gotten used to considering the year 1054 as the moment of the short-circuit between Rome and Constantinople and automatically, up to atomic level (in the cellular, societal sense) its repercussions definitively dislocate the previous realities. Nothing is farther from the truth. 1054 is just a year like all others,

hyperbolized by the militant attitude manifest in historiography over the past 150 years and which has estranged us from the life lived by the people of the 11th century. The consequences of 1054 are extremely vague, even within the Roman Church, at its core, as in the case of the Byzantine imperial perception. The 13th century will definitively separate Rome from Constantinople, but this is not the place for that discussion. Consequently, the presence within the Church of the Arpadian Kingdom of clergymen who possess Oriental anthroponymy does not come as a big surprise (in the sense of their Byzantine names). Such clergymen led dioceses of perceived Latin structure (this is also a matter to be clarified by Hungarian historiography, since our Hungarian colleagues' explanations on this issue are still anachronistic). Of course, in the particular situation of these "Greek" bishops—for want of a better name—the anthroponymic clarifications are different from those of the Latin bishops, since, if the Latin monks or the regular and secular Latin clergy do not necessarily change their given name, in the case of the Greek monks who became bishops we are dealing with a name change once they become monks. Hence, in fact, the distinction which can be made without much analysis between the Greek bishops and the Latin ones, based on the professionalization of some hierarchic names.

The fact that the first hierarchs from the Kingdom of Hungary were of both Greek and Latin extraction one is proved by the last decade's research of some Hungarian historians. István Baán is one of them and he bases his hypothesis on the existence of three documents, the codex *Athon Esphigmenou 131*, fol. 61 r–v, *Athon Dionysiou 120*, fols. 701–703v and *Parisinus graecus 48*, fols. 255v–263v, which refer to the existence of a Metropolitan See of Hungary, placed under the jurisdiction of the Patriarchate in Constantinople in the 11th–12th centuries. These dates, taken from the respective manuscripts, are confirmed by the *typikon* of the Veszprémvölgy monastery, of Greek rite and founded at the royal initiative. They clarify, according to the Hungarian historian, the enigma regarding the founding of the second Hungarian archbishopric, that of Kalocsa. In the list of metropolitan sees, *Tourkia* is directly followed by *Rhósia*, and this position in the *taxis* is not accidental. In fact, we can trace a parallel between the development of the Byzantine "mission" in Hungary and Russia. The bishoprics situated in the eastern part of the Kingdom of Hungary are considered to be suffragans of this metropolitan see. We refer here to the bishoprics of Cenad (Csanád), Bihar (Bihar) and Transylvania. Baán's suppositions are based on the fact that, together with Kalocsa, the three bishoprics previously mentioned do not have any founding documents (charters) and it is a known fact that the Byzantine Empire did not issue such documents, unlike the European monarchs and the Holy See. The seat of the Tourkia metropolitan see/archbishopric of Kalocsa is occupied by Greek hierarchs such as Ioannes (1028), Antonios³ or Georgios,

and the first Latin archbishop named Desiderius appeared only in 1075. The Greek metropolitan see became a Latin archbishopric only later, during the 12th century.⁴ Here we can mention the case of Anastasius, also known as Asztrik, the first “Hungarian” archbishop who attended an imperial assembly on German lands. The name of the prelate is of clear Oriental descent, although it is assumed that special pressure was exercised upon him to leave his Polish sovereign and accept a dignity within the Hungarian prince’s entourage.⁵ Then comes the case of Gerard of Cenad, a Venetian recluse of Italian ethnic extraction, but with typically Oriental habitudes and mortification practices, who followed the opposite itinerary by changing his name, while still in Venice, from George to Gerard, but remained faithful to the Eastern rite. All these elements have determined Agnès Gerhards, in the recent *Dictionnaire historique des ordres religieux*, to consider that:

L’influence du monachisme grec [in the Kingdom of Hungary, our note] se manifeste par l’existence de monastères doubles peuplés de religieux grecs et latins qui vivent dans la même communauté, les premiers sous la règle de saint Basile, évêque de Césarée en Cappadoce au IV^e siècle et fondateur du monachisme grec, les seconds sous celle de saint Benoît. Ce type d’organisation persiste jusqu’au XIV^e siècle. Mais des monastères exclusivement grecs se multiplient notamment dans la vallée de Veszprém au sud-ouest de Budapest. L’influence grecque se manifeste aussi par l’installation de mouvements érémitiques venus d’Italie du Sud. Ce courant est représenté par Nil de Rosanno (910–1005), représentatif d’un monachisme grec très marqué par l’anachorétisme et dû à l’influence de Byzance en Italie du Sud.⁶

Therefore it is without a doubt that the Greek-Latin beginnings of Christianity in Pannonia have important consequences at the anthroponymic level, and the onomatology of the high clergy shows these influences during the 12th century. Given the cultural-ecclesiastic and also the ethnic mixture, the bishops and other prelates deemed Latin thus reveal by their own names another career and ethnic background than the ones alleged by a certain nationalistic historiography.

The ecclesiastical dignitaries, such as they can be accounted for in 11th–12th century documents, are just bishops and *praepositus*, because they are the ones who had access to the actual drawing up of the documents. It is a known fact that within the Kingdom of Hungary the chancellery is a late royal initiative (from the time of Béla III), and the ones in charge of structuring and managing the written documents were exclusively the people of the Church. The scribes are also of ecclesial extraction, coming from the hierarchy’s retinue; in the 11th–12th centuries they usually came from the same geographical area as the superior clergymen, or came together with the latter’s retinue, and we even encounter

some *self made men* who assisted the high-ranking clergy in matters of personal chancellery. There is a typology of private clerks which are usually recruited from within the space of northern Italy or from eastern and northern France, and almost never from the Kingdom of Hungary, at least until the second half of the 12th century.

THE EPISCOPAL anthroponymy from the diplomas referring to Transylvania or containing names of prelates from Transylvania is a composite one; it is therefore impossible to speak about an anthroponymic uniformity or about ethnic homogeneity. As we have previously explained, the episcopal careers in *Christianitas* (and the Kingdom of Hungary, although a peripheral one, is no exception) are dictated by interests which transcend ethnicity, often relying on the principle of obedience and utility to the Arpadian kings or, quite rarely at the time, on a meritocratic basis—although it is hard to identify this aspect in the Hungarian case—or simply on the relation with one of the laymen or ecclesiasts in a position of authority. In the case of the Hungarian kings, the appointment of the bishops is performed without too much intrusion from the Roman authority, which, until the second half of the 12th century, does not interfere with the prelates' appointments. The latter were generally elected by the chapters of the churches and subjected to the final decision of the monarch. The Hungarian monarchs endorsed the appointment as bishops of those who might have supported their unifying efforts, regardless of their ethnic origin (we know that evangelization or the founding of religious structures anticipates by far the administrative presence of political organisms), or better said, were as far as possible from the tribal bickering and arrangements which might have hurt or diminished the nominal authority within the patrimonial kingdom. So, reflecting this “game of interests,” the anthroponymy of the bishops contains elements from different onomastic stocks, among which we can distinguish the Roman-Latin, the Greek-Orthodox and the Germanic ones. The Hungarian element which exists in the equation of episcopal appointments cannot be excluded, but in the absence of prestigious Christian names in the Hungarian anthroponymic patrimony, the names established by Christian onomatology were adopted.

In the list of bishops we found the following anthroponyms: Adrian, bishop of Transylvania (1192, 1196, 1197, 1198, 1199), Andrew, archbishop of Kalocsa (1181), Baranus, bishop of Transylvania (1139), Bestertius, bishop of Cenad (1138), Boleslav, bishop of Vác (1199), Catapan (or Cathapan), bishop of Eger, but also royal chancellor (1198, 1199), Calan (or Kalan), bishop of Pécs (1199), Everard, bishop of Nyitra (1183), Elluin (Elvin), bishop of Oradea (1199), George, bishop of Győr (1111), Gregory, bishop of Zara, Iaus, bishop of Vác (1165), John (Ivan), bishop of Veszprém (1183), John, elected bishop

(1165), John, bishop of Cenad (1198, 1199), Job (Iob), bishop of Vác (1183) and then archbishop of Strigonium (1199), Lawrence, bishop of Cenad (1111), Luke, archbishop of Strigonium (1165, 1169), Kalenda, bishop of Veszprém (1199), Matthew, bishop of Veszprém (1111), Marcel, bishop of Vác (1111), Martirius, archbishop of Strigonium (1156), Michael, elected bishop of Oradea (1156), Macarius, bishop (1165), Micodin (or Mycudin), bishop of Győr (1181, 1183), Nicholas, archbishop of Strigonium (1181, 1183), Paul, archbishop of Kalocsa (1111), Paul, bishop of Transylvania (1181), Peter, bishop of Agria (1181, 1183), Simon, bishop of Transylvania (1111), Simon, bishop of Pécs (1111), Sixtus, bishop of Bihar (1111), Stephen, bishop of Cenad (1156, 1166), Soma (Sarna), bishop (1165), Saul, archbishop of Kalocsa (1199), Vilcina, bishop of Transylvania (1166), Wolfer, bishop of Agria (1111), Walter, bishop of Oradea and then bishop of Transylvania (1138, 1156), Ugrinus, bishop of Győr (1198–1199).

Undoubtedly the most significant document which captures the onomastic realities of the 11th century is the diploma from the year 1111 in which King Coloman of Hungary confirms a document of King Stephen I which granted a third of the customs duty to the monastery of Zobor. The sequence of names reiterated in another document from 1113 reflects the confessional-cultural constellation of the bishops from the young tribal kingdom: Paul, Simon, Simeon, Matthew, Marcel, George, Sixtus, Wolfer, Lawrence, Gregory. It is noticeable, even without any philological analysis, that none of these names is Hungarian; these names clearly reflect the composition of the clergy and its confessional extraction. Simeon, Matthew, George and possibly also Gregory are of Eastern tradition, while Marcel, Lawrence, Sixtus and possibly Simon belong to the Roman confession. Wolfer needs no further explanations, being a confirmation of the institutional presence of the German element within the institutions of the Kingdom of Hungary. We ground our observations in the analysis of various lists of names coming from different regions of *Christianitas* and which demonstrate beyond any doubt that the names George, Simeon, Matthew and Gregory do not appear in Western onomatology until the 13th century, but even then in a very discrete manner. Some criticism might be raised in connection to the anthroponym Gregory, which is assumed by several pontiffs, the last one according to the logic of the present study being Gregory VII. We are dealing with a distinctive name which draws on the archetype represented by Pope Gregory the Great, but remains relatively rarely used outside the pontifical onomatology.

Out of the names which belong to the anthroponymic stock of clear Oriental tradition (some purely monastic), but are found in episcopalian structures deemed “Catholic” in the historiography, we notice the bishops Macarius (mentioned in 1165), Nicodemus,⁷ who served at Győr between 1176 and 1187 and

is mentioned in 1181 and 1183, and Cathapan, bishop of Agria, but also royal chancellor mentioned in the years 1198 and 1199. The three clearly illustrate Agnès Gerhards' thesis on the bi-ritual Christianity in the Kingdom of Hungary and on the collaboration of the Hungarian kings with the Oriental monks who populated the monasteries under their nominal authority. If Macarius (from the Greek adjective *makarios*) is in fact Macarius II⁸ and functions as bishop of Pécs (1162–1186) and the anthroponymic unit represents the Greek equivalent of Felix⁹ and brings along an augural invocation of the state of beatitude of the man who bears this name, as an anticipation of celestial beatitude, Nicodemus is the perfect synonym for Nicholas, composed of *nike* (victory) and *demos* (people), and recalls the figure of Nicodemus, the Pharisee who believed in Jesus Christ and prepared his crucified body for the funeral. The surprising fact is—and we say it without any fear of accusations of protochronism—that the formulas Micodin and Mycudin found in the quoted diplomas are hypochoresitic forms shared by the Romanian language¹⁰ as well. Cataphan,¹¹ the bishop who reached a level of institutional intimacy with the Hungarian monarch, is a hierarch whose typically Greek name is composed of *katà* and *epànos*, meaning “the one who sits above.” The *catapan* was a high-ranking official in the Greek empire, one step above the *strategos*, and who performed the functions of a governor at the boundaries of the empire. In our particular case, we cannot infer the actual origin of the character bearing this name; he might have had origins in the Greek monastic order in the Kingdom of Hungary, or might have belonged to a group of Greeks who arrived with Béla III's retinue, after the latter had been detained at the Byzantine court and baptized Alexius. This triad, Macarius, Nicodemus and Cathapanos, confirms the powerful presence of Greek monks in the episcopal structure of the early Kingdom of Hungary. Many other names of Greek linguistic genealogy can be associated to the Greek clergy who entered the ecclesiastical hierarchy of old Pannonia. We shall mention here the bishop John (Ivan) of Veszprém, the bishop Kalenda of Veszprém, mentioned in a diploma dating from 1199 together with Cathapan. In fact, if we look at the sequence Matthew, Ivan, Kalenda (Kalanda) we will notice a succession—albeit broken—of hierarchs with non-Western names and therefore possibly associated to the Greek Church. If we bring into discussion the manuscripts mentioned by István Baán, which are confirmed by the *typikon* of the “Greek” monastery at Veszprémvölgy founded by Gisele, the wife of King Stephen,¹² we have indisputable evidence of the Eastern cultural atmosphere which characterized the Veszprém area. Further continuing the analysis, our attention is drawn by two contemporary archbishops whose dioceses overlap quite often in the 12th century. It is the case of Nicholas, the archbishop of Strigonium, and of the archbishop Andrew of Kalocsa (preceded by a prelate named Kosma/Cosma, mentioned in 1169). Of course, in this particular

case we find ourselves on shakier ground and we cannot safely say to which cultural area the two belong. Their dioceses have—in the year of the attestation—an undeniably Latin character, but their names occur just too early for the diffusion of the anthroponyms Andrew and Nicholas within the territory situated under the jurisdiction of the Roman Church. Even when we encounter them, they are in the area of prolonged or repeated contact with the communities in communion with Constantinople or with a Greek ethnic profile. The diffusion of the name Nicholas is particularly notable within the German area, and still this might be a possibility to take into account. Three other names of hierarchs such as Michael, Paul and Stephen, to which we could add Saul, fall under the same logic. In the absence of documentary determinations (which, in the case of hierarchs, were actually impossible to make) we can assume that they belong to the Roman Church, even if their names, in the context of the time and according to anthroponymic geography, are on a subtle thin line between Oriental and Western onomastics. Among the holders of eparchies we can distinguish those with Slavic names, such as the previously mentioned Ivan, but also Bestertius or Boleslav. We shall insist here upon Bestertius, and Boleslav will be dealt with in the category of the provosts. Bestertius, bishop of Cenad, mentioned in 1138, takes name of the martyr of Slovakian descent, the bishop of Nyitra, who was marginalized by the pagan Hungarians alongside Gerard of Cenad in the year 1046. Eloquently enough, the name of the fellow martyr Gerard is probably taken by a Slav, who runs the diocese of the Venetian eremite, almost a century after the martyrdom, but it is symptomatic that the name of the martyr bishop Gerard is no longer found in the episcopal onomatology. One of the extremely rare Old Testament anthroponyms taken by a bishop is that of Job, archbishop of Strigonium,¹³ known in Hungarian historiography as Jób Tudós. Here we find an almost fascinating episode, extremely relevant for the present research. It concerns the correspondence that Job had with Byzantine emperor Isaac II Angelos,¹⁴ out of which only a letter remained, from the emperor to the Latin prelate bearing the name of a monk and who had probably had an Oriental career.¹⁵

The inventories and studies drawn up by the historians interested in anthroponymy reveal one constant fact: until the emergence of the mendicant orders (at beginning of the 13th century) the Old Testament names are avoided by the official anthroponymy of the Roman Church. On the contrary, the Church which we call (a bit improperly) Orthodox makes an absolutely natural use of Old Testament names, especially if invoked in episodes suited for homiletics, and Job is one of them.

The name John is so frequently used in both onomastic registers, Occidental and Oriental, that any analysis becomes superfluous. Without an ethnic identification, when the text speaks about one named Ioannes, it becomes impossible to

verify a particular connection. The constructive doubt appears, in the case of this name, when the scribe modifies the writing being captivated by its pronunciation. In our case the only such example is Ivan.

From the category of names which are rigorously dependent on the Roman calendar, we can mention Peter, but its modest presence as opposed to Paul speaks about the limited imposition of the mechanisms of the Roman Reform into the Kingdom of Hungary. Among others, we find Adrian, Luke, the famous archbishop of Strigonium of Hungarian descent but who had harsh disagreements with the royal authority, Martirius, another archbishop of Strigonium whose origin is obviously non-Hungarian, and Simon, the alternative name to that of Peter.

From the category of bishops' names of Germanic origin we encounter in Transylvania the names of Elluin (Elvin), meaning *companion in everything*; Everard originating from Eberhard (*eber* meaning "boar" and *hard* meaning "strength, courage") symbolizing the force and power of the wild boar; Walter (made of *wald*, "to lead" and *hari*, "army") meaning "leader of the army." Vilcina seems to be a Germanic name, representing a Latinization of the name Volkina (with multiple variants in other diplomas—but which are not part our research—such as Vilkina, Vlkina, Volkona, Velchene).

Ugrinus is a Hungarian variant of Hugolinus, derived from the Germanic *hugu* which means "perspicacious spirit." Soma (also read as Sarna) is the Greek equivalent for "body." Iaus is a name which is considered—by Hungarian onomatology—to be a copyist's distortion of the Old Testament name of Job.

In the case of the provosts,¹⁶ the situation is different from that of the bishops. They are directly appointed by the Apostolic See, either with or without the agreement of the local authorities. The freestanding prepositure is a spiritual attribute of the Holy See, but from the end of the 12th century it also becomes a temporal instrument of Rome. Therefore the appointment to the position of provost of either spiritual or material matters represents a barometer of the attempts of the Holy See to strengthen the ecclesiastical infrastructure and reattach it to Rome. By analyzing the names that we find in the diplomas issued in the 10th–12th centuries and associated with Transylvanian provosts, we have the following inventory: Boleslav, provost of Buda (1169), Desiderius, provost of Sibiu (1200), Felicianus, provost of Székesfehérvár (1111), Primogenitus, provost of Arad (1156), Richard, provost of Arad (1177), Robert, provost of Strigonium. The mere enumeration of these names reveals the lack of even one single name or of at least one single unit from the Hungarian onomastic stock. We can get an idea about the Hungarian onomastic pool in 12th century Transylvania, predominantly tribal, with some Khazar, Uz or Pecheneg intrusions, from three documents: one issued on 3 September 1138, and signed by the bish-

ops of Cenad and Bihor, another from 1177 issued by Béla III and confirmed by King Emeric in the years 1202–1203 and, finally, the Registry of Oradea (1208–1235) which contains more names—only some of them probably given at baptism—from the end of the 12th century. The names of the provosts appointed by the Holy See prove the linguistic and probably ethnic variety of the holders, forcing us to consider that Rome, undoubtedly in complicity with the local authorities, had decided that the provosts should be nominated from within the prestigious non-Hungarian clergy that operated within the Arpadian Kingdom. Boleslav, whose significance is “the most blissful of all the blissful” has a Slavic origin, being of Czech extraction, and later on acquired by the Polish, Bolesław Chrobry being a duke and then the first king of Poland, the nephew of Boleslav the Cruel, duke of Bohemia. With the triad Desiderius, Felicianus¹⁷ and Primogenitus we certainly find ourselves in the area of names of undeniable Latin origin, which can definitely be assumed by the Latin clergy from the entire Christendom, the anthroponymic research suggesting however that these were maintained in the regions where Latin was the linguistic platform for the vernacular languages. In this particular context, the case of Italian and French can be invoked. We consider these characters to be of Italic origin, since the northern French area was still quite corrupt by the mixture with German names and the Provence area had virtually no contacts with the remote Pannonia. Felicianus is one of the martyrs of Diocletian’s era, murdered together with Primus in 297, and they appear in the Roman Church calendar as the martyr couple of Saints Felicianus and Primus, celebrated on 9 June, according to the *Martyriologium Hieronymianum*. It is interesting to notice that the bodies of the two martyrs were transferred in 648 by Pope Theodore to the church of San Stefano in Rotondo (which has symbolic connections with the Hungarian nation from the late medieval period) and in the 12th and 13th centuries their faces were represented in mosaics in the Palatine Chapel in Palermo and in the Basilica di San Marco of Venice. Desiderius is a late Latin name that means “the long-expected son,” revived in the 4th and 5th centuries, and whose historical career is mostly due to the Longobard king who was a contemporary of Charlemagne. But, prior to this, there are mentions of a Saint Desiderius of Langres martyred in 346, of Saint Desiderius of Vienne martyred in 607 or 611 and Saint Desiderius of Cahors who died in 655. Primogenitus does not require detailed explanations, since the nature of this name is obvious. In this case we can assume a possible ecclesiastical career envisaged for the first born by his parents. The other two provosts, Richard and Robert, have such an obvious onomastic stamp that they practically recommend themselves as being Germanic just by virtue of their names. The name Richard, although of Provençal origin (made of *rikia*, “powerful” and *hardhu*, “valuable”), has had quite an impressive career in the Germanic envi-

ronment. In his turn, Robert comes of the Germanic word *brodeberht*, meaning “resplendent with glory.” The conclusion we can draw by studying the names of the provosts—which exist in the documents related to Transylvania—is that these prelates who function under the jurisdiction of Rome cannot be qualified as Hungarians, since the names they had at that moment did not exist in the Hungarian anthroponymic stock, which was markedly tribal. This situation was anticipated since, as we have previously explained, the situation of Christianity was quite precarious in the Hungarian patrimonial kingdom.

In this context we should mention a medium-rank clerk who succeeds in preserving his memory due to a circumstance in which the Holy See is directly involved. This is the archdeacon of Cluj, Heinrich, who received some privileges from Innocent III on 14–15 December 1199. The name has a clear Germanic stamp, thereby confirming the Germanic early contribution to the founding of Cluj. It is composed of the terms *haimi* (house, fatherland) and *rich* (strong) and can be translated as “powerful in his land/house,” a name with a royal overtones. Haimrich was the original name, but it contracted to the definitive form Heinrich.

The following circumstance cannot be denied: with Innocent III’s pontificate, the policy of subordinating the appointment of bishops becomes more intense, and the typically Oriental ecclesiastical names decrease in number to the point of disappearing altogether at the beginning of the 14th century, a tendency indicative of the new course of religious life in the Kingdom of Hungary. From the category of prelates with a clear Oriental monastic ascent we can mention Zosima (meaning “vital,” the Greek correspondent of the Latin name Vitalius), bishop of Oradea in 1265, Jeremiah, bishop of Vác in 1243–1256(9) or Cletus (derived from the Greek *anakletos*, “the called-upon”), bishop of Agria between 1225 and 1242. Concurrently, the well-known Registry of Oradea lists—for the years 1219–1220—one Basil, the superior of Kőrümonostora, a monastery near Szolnok. He would be replaced in 1235 by another superior called Gregory.¹⁸ In the first case, without a doubt, the name Basil indicates the Greek rite of the individual in question. In the case of Gregory, in the 13th century we are in an uncertain territory, due to the ingression of this name from the East to the West.

AFTER REVIEWING the anthroponymy of the high and medium level clergy, such as it appears in the diplomatic documents of Transylvanian relevance, we can safely assert that the appointment of bishops involved the conjunction between the human potential present in the area, prevalently attached to the values of the Greek Church, and the import of characters from the Western clerical pool. The names of the hierarchs present in the Kingdom of Hungary in the 12th century is quite a precise barometer for the ritual am-

bivalence and the political vacillation of the kingdom between *Christianitas* and the still functioning Byzantine *Commonwealth*, while on the horizon—through the agency of the provosts and of other institutional structures—the Holy See introduced the hierocratic reform. The disappearance—in the 14th century—of the typically Greek monastic names or of the Oriental ones from the episcopal onomatology clearly demonstrates that the hierocratic reform had advanced into the Hungarian territory, receiving a powerful (although double-edged) support after the establishment of the new Angevin dynasty, one that was excessively homogenizing at the institutional level. □

Notes

1. The Greek and Latin adjectives in this situation refer to the rite and not the ethnic group.
2. “La notion d’ordre religieux au sens que nous donnons aujourd’hui à cette expression, est historiquement liée à l’affirmation de la puissance papale comme autorité coextensive à l’Église universelle en tant même que cette Église est une société originale et autonome par rapport à toute communauté nationale et locale. Quand de tels ordres, potentiellement universels, ont existé, la papauté les a utilisés comme des instruments de son action, soit au plan politique de l’Empire et des royaumes, en vue surtout de la croisade et de l’entente qu’elle supposait rétablie entre les princes chrétiens, soit au plan de la politique ecclésiastique et de l’instauration d’un certain droit, pour réduire l’indépendance des Églises locales. Le Saint-Siège a trouvé, dans ces ‘ordres,’ des hommes et une force de caractère supranational, supralocal.” Yves Congar, “Aspects ecclésiologiques de la querelle entre mendiants et séculiers dans la seconde moitié du XIII^e siècle et le début du XIV^e,” *Archives d’histoire doctrinale et littéraire du Moyen Âge* 28 (1961): 38.
3. There is a lead seal dating from that period, with the inscription Antonios, *monk, singhelos and proedros of Tourkia*. Vasile Iorgulescu, *Le Sud-Est Européen entre Byzance et Occident aux Xe–XIV^e siècles: Le cas des Roumains* (Iași: Trinitas, 2005), 94.
4. István Baán, “La Métropole de Tourkia: L’organisation de l’Église byzantine en Hongrie au Moyen Âge,” in *Byzantium: identity, image, influence: XIX International Congress of Byzantine Studies, University of Copenhagen, 18–24 August 1966* (Copenhagen: Eventus, 1996).
5. S. M. Jedlicki, “La Création du premier archêvêché à Gniezno et ses conséquences au point de vue des rapports entre la Pologne et l’Empire germanique,” *Revue historique de droit français et étranger* 4, 12 (1933): 681.
6. Agnès Gerhards, *Dictionnaire historique des ordres religieux* (Paris: Fayard, 1998), 305.
7. Preceded by a certain Zahee between 1142 and 1149.
8. Macarius I held office sometime between 1138 and presumably 1142, and later between 1148 and 1160, his eparchy being led by the bishop Anthimius.

9. Aurelia Bălan-Mihailovici, *Dicționar onomastic creștin. Repere etimologice și martirologice* (Bucharest: Sofia, 2009), 345.
10. *Ibid.*, 414–416.
11. Catapan also seems to be the name of the first attested bishop of Agria, sometime around 1009; a century later, around 1102, the diocese is led by a certain Procopius.
12. János Bak, “Queens as Scapegoats in Medieval Hungary,” in *Queens and Queenship in Medieval Europe*, ed. A. Duggan (Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 1997), 224.
13. It is worth mentioning here another archbishop of Strigonium with an Oriental monachal name: Seraphim, who held this office between 1095 and 1104.
14. László Solymosi, “Chartes archiépiscopales et épiscopales en Hongrie avant 1250,” in *Die Diplomatie der Bischofsurkunde vor 1250*, eds. Christoph Haidacher and Werner Köfler (Innsbruck: Tiroler Landesarchiv, 1995), 160.
15. Gyula Moravcsik, *Fontes Byzantini historiae Hungaricae aeo ducum et regum ex stirpe Arpad descendantium* (Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1984), 248–251.
16. “(Latin, praepositus; French, prévôt; German, Probst) Anciently (St. Jerome, ‘Ep.’ II, xiv: Ad Rusticum monach.) every chapter had an archpriest and an archdeacon. The former officiated in the absence of the bishop and had general supervision of the choir, while the latter was the head of the chapter and administered its temporal affairs. Later the archpriest was called decanus (dean) and the archdeacon praepositus (provost). At present the chief dignity of a chapter is usually styled dean, though in some countries, as in England, the term provost is applied to him. *The provost, by whatever name he may be known, is appointed by the Holy See in accordance with the fourth rule of the Roman Chancery.* It is his duty to see that all capitular statutes are observed. To be authentic, all acts of the chapter, in addition to the seal of the chapter, require his signature. Extraordinary meetings of the chapter are convened by him, generally, however, on written request of a majority of the chapter, and with the consent of the bishop. He presides in chapter at the election of a vicar capitular, who within eight days of the death of the bishop is to be chosen as the administrator of the vacant see. He conducts the ceremonies at the installation of canons-elect, investing them with the capitular insignia, assigning them places in choir, etc. In choir, the first place after the bishop belongs to him. In the absence of the bishop, or in case the see is vacant, the provost conducts episcopal ceremonial functions, while he takes precedence of all, even of the vicar capitular. He must be present, however, personally, not being allowed a substitute. When the bishop pontificates, the provost is assistant priest. It is his office to administer Viaticum to the bishop, and to conduct the bishop’s obsequies.” <http://www.catholic.org/encyclopedia/view.php?id=9706>.
17. It seems that he would later become bishop of Transylvania between 1125 and 1127, then he would return to Strigonium as head of the archdiocese.
18. *Documente privind istoria României, C. Transilvania, Veacul XI, XII și XIII.*, vol. 1 (1075–1250) (Bucharest: Ed. Academiei, 1951), 97, 105, 147.

Abstract**Greek Monks As Latin Bishops in the Kingdom of Hungary and in Transylvania (11th–12th Centuries): An Anthroponymic Contribution**

One of the most sensitive areas of onomatology in the medieval era, regarding the anthroponymic dimension, is the part reserved to the names of the clergy. It is significant because it finely detects the impulses coming from the area controlled by the Church, both Roman and Byzantine. Given the local cultural-ecclesiastic and also ethnic mixture, the bishops and other prelates deemed Latin thus reveal by their own names another career and ethnic background than the ones alleged by a certain nationalistic historiography. The names of the hierarchs present in the Kingdom of Hungary in the 12th century is quite a precise barometer for the ritual ambivalence and the political vacillation of the kingdom between *Christianitas* and the still functioning Byzantine *Commonwealth*, while on the horizon—through the agency of the provosts and of other institutional structures—the Holy See introduced the hierocratic reform.

Keywords

onomatology, anthroponymy, clerical anthroponymy, Kingdom of Hungary, Transylvania