

Historical-Economic Aspects Pertaining to the Bishopric of Transylvania As Reflected in the Pontifical Tithe Register (1332–1337)

ROBERT-MARIUS
MIHALACHE

The data presented here demonstrate that the system of papal tithes also led to the institutional territorialization of the parishes located on the eastern fringes of Societas Christiana, more precisely, in Transylvania.

THE MATTER of pontifical tithes is hardly a novel one, as over the past decade our historiography has seen the publication of various texts dealing with this typically ecclesiastical type of contribution, but only in a tangential manner. This register has been analyzed in the context of certain anthroponymic analyses or in an attempt to outline the geographic limits of the Latin Church in medieval Transylvania.¹ The economic dimension has been disregarded in these analyses, which focused on the tithe register covering six years (1332–1337) drawn up by the envoys of Pope John XXII, the tax collectors Jacobus Berengarii and Raimundus de Bonofato.²

Consequently, the present article provides a historical-economic analysis

Robert-Marius Mihalache

Researcher at the Center for Transylvanian Studies, Romanian Academy, Cluj-Napoca.

Also published in Romanian in *Anuarul Institutului de Istorie “George Barițiu” din Cluj-Napoca* 54 (2015): 37–50.

of the tithe register drawn up by the aforementioned papal tax collectors, for at least two reasons: firstly, it has never been analyzed in order to determine the main rationale behind the register, which was economic in nature; secondly, because this register is structurally more complex than the other registers drawn up by the tax collectors active in the Kingdom of Hungary prior to 1331.³

We provide an inventory of parishes⁴ and an estimate of the overall financial situation at the level of their archdeaconry, in order to see what were, throughout the whole of Transylvania, the tithes paid by the clergymen of the Bishopric of Transylvania to the Apostolic Chamber of Avignon, between 1332 and 1337.

In what concerns the general context, it should be said that generally such registers were not drawn up only in the Kingdom of Hungary, but also in Poland,⁵ Bohemia, Aragon, France, etc., that is, in the European kingdoms of the *Societas Christiana*.⁶ The papal tithe registers could be deemed as belonging to the “historical-economic heritage,” because they were drawn up for fiscal purposes by the Holy See, hosted throughout the 14th century by the city of Avignon, or indeed by its Apostolic Chamber, a fundamental component of the pontifical executive apparatus, defined as a “government” by historian Paolo Prodi,⁷ in order to keep a precise record of the tithes⁸ collected the kingdoms of *Christianitas*.

The legal framework for the collection of tithes was created by the papal decisions adopted during the General Council of Vienne of 1311–1312, chaired by Pope Clement V (1305–1314). However, in the Kingdom of Hungary (which also included Transylvania) the actual collection of the tithe began decades after the adoption of the canons at the Council of Vienne, more precisely during the pontificate of John XXII (1316–1334), who was one of the most effective Avignon popes.

In the 1320s, the disagreements between the Holy See and the Holy Roman Empire, represented by Pope John XXII and the German King Louis IV (1314–1347)—Holy Roman Emperor from 1328—intensified and even went through some acute stages. The conflict stemmed from the pope’s refusal to acknowledge the imperial title of Louis of Bavaria. A representative of the spiritual power, the pope also exercised temporal power at several levels, but to a lesser extent than the all-powerful Innocent III (1198–1216), considered to have been the most powerful pope of the Middle Ages.⁹ This military conflict between Pope John XXII and King Louis IV was draining the coffers of both parties involved. Apart from this conflict, the Holy See represented by Pope John XXII was involved in a grandiose project that demanded completion: the building of the new papal palace at Avignon.¹⁰ Such expenditures demanded a steady supply of funds.¹¹

The amounts to be collected in the kingdom led by Charles Robert of Anjou (1301–1342) were inferior to the ones coming from the Western kingdoms, because the local Church in Hungary was less affluent. Still, the money provided by the Angevin Kingdom of Hungary could ensure a steady financial supply for the Apostolic Chamber.¹² These may have been the reasons why tithes had to be collected in the Kingdom of Hungary, between 1332 and 1337, two decades after the adoption of the canons regulating the procedure. The official reason, however, was the well-known one: the crusade.¹³

The episode involving the two aforementioned tax collectors, operating in the Kingdom of Hungary between 1331 and 1337, was atypical in the sense that it did not follow the conventional model of papal tax collection in this region. Its extraordinary character also had to do with the dubious attitude of the tax collectors towards the papal desiderata, which they met with difficulty, also because of the direct or indirect influence exerted by the local protagonists (spiritual or temporal). Even if they were somewhat obstructed in the collection of the tithes,¹⁴ an action that generated the register investigated by us, the two tax collectors brought a positive contribution to the centralizing policy of the Holy See.

The documents that touch upon the tithe register can be found in certain collections of sources, such as: *Documente privind istoria României, Veacul XIV, C, Transilvania*, vol. III (1331–1340)¹⁵; *Monumenta Vaticana Hungariae, Series I, Tom. I. Rationes collectorum Pontificiarum. Pápai tizedszedők számadásai 1281–1375*,¹⁶ and Jakó Zsigmond, *Erdélyi okmánytár*, vol. II (1301–1339).¹⁷

Monumenta Vaticana Hungariae is the most compact of the three aforementioned collections of sources, especially from a compositional point of view, as it records the tithes collected in eleven Hungarian bishoprics (*Diocesis Waradiensis, Transsilvana, Chanadiensis, Zagrabiensis, Bosnensis, Colocensis, Strigoniensis, Vaciensis, Quinqueecclesiensis, Agriensis, Wesprimiensis*).

According to the papal tithe register, at that time the Bishopric of Transylvania (*Ecclesia Transsilvana*) included thirteen subunits: *archidiaconatu Albensi*—Alba, *a. de Thorda*—Turda, *Ozd, a. Hunodiensis*—Hunedoara, Cojocna (Kolozs), sometimes Cluj (Kolozsvár), *a. de Keukellev*—Tárnava (Küküllő), Tylegd, *a. de Doboka*—Dăbâca, Szolnok, *a. de Karazna*—Crasna (Kraszna), *a. de Ugacha*—Ugocsa, *a. de Kyzdi*—Kézdi, and *a. de Zothmar*—Sátmar (Szatmár, Satu Mare).¹⁸

When compiling the fiscal record, the tax collectors did their best to follow the structure of the archdeaconries belonging to the Bishopric of Transylvania. This is particularly obvious in the first year of their mission, when a significant amount was collected. Maybe this came as a consequence of the impetus given to the action by John XXII who, in keeping with the traditional pontifical pow-

er, could resort to one of the harshest punishments against those who refused to pay the tithe—excommunication.¹⁹

The amounts paid varied in quantity and also in what concerned the type of currency used: *banalis*, *denarius*, *ferto argenti*, *florenus*, *grossus*, *kuntinus*, *locto*, *marca*, *pensa*, *pondus*, *sectinus* etc., all of different denominations.

The purpose of the present article is to identify as accurately as possible the amounts collected in tithe from the Transylvanian archdeaconries, which requires an approximation of the types of currency employed. Consequently, the final amounts shall be expressed in silver marks according to the Buda standard (*marca argenti*).²⁰

The entries concerning the taxes collected in the first year (Table 1) are more complex than those of the following years. The archdeaconry of Turda²¹ opens the list of those who paid the first installment for the first year of tax collecting, followed by those of Alba,²² Ozd, the deaneries of Sebeș (Szászsebes) and Orăștie (Szászváros) (belonging to the archdeaconry of Alba), then the archdeaconries of Hunedoara, Cojocna, the deanery of Spring, the archdeaconries of Târnava and Tylegd, the deanery of Bistrița (Beszterce) (belonging to the archdeaconry of Dăbâca), and then the archdeaconry of Szolnok.²³ There is no particular logic to this succession, and quite possibly the entries were made as the money was handed over to the tax collectors. The same holds true for the second installment.²⁴

If we compare the lists of parishes in the Transylvanian archdeaconries for the first and the second installment of the first year (1332), we see a significant fluctuation. For instance, in the case of the archdeaconry of Szolnok, only one parish is listed as having paid the first installment of the tithe, while the second installment was paid by 16 parishes. However, this second figure cannot be deemed to precisely indicate the number of parishes belonging at that time to the archdeaconry of Szolnok.

The main purpose of the tithe registers was to keep a record of the amounts paid by the parishes of the Transylvanian archdeaconries to the Apostolic Chamber. The precise number of these parishes was of secondary importance. Consequently, the number of contributing parishes listed in the register could not have been the total number of parishes belonging to the 13 archdeaconries,²⁵ as an archdeaconry could not have consisted of a single parish, as was the case with the archdeaconry of Crasna, or eight parishes, as in the case of the archdeaconry of Hunedoara.

TABLE 1. PARISHES AND TITHES IDENTIFIED
FOR THE YEAR OF PAYMENT 1332 (FIRST YEAR)

Archdeaconry	Number of identified parishes	Amounts identified (in Buda silver marks)	Weight of identified marks (g)	Equivalent of marks in kilograms of silver
Turda	32	4.7	1,153.9	1.15
Alba	97	32.1	7,881.5	7.88
Ozd	43	8.2	2,025.6	2.02
Hunedoara	8	1.9	466.5	0.46
Cojocna	20	5.3	1,301.3	1.30
Târnava	36	4.3	1,055.7	1.05
Tylegd	40	2.2	540.1	0.54
Dăbâca	40	9.6	2,369.3	2.36
Szolnok	16	1.4	356.0	0.35
Crasna	1	0.1	39.2	0.04
Kézdi	17	0.8	196.4	0.19
Satu Mare	24	1.8	441.9	0.44
Ugocsa	14	3.1	761.1	0.76
TOTAL for 13 archdeaconries	388	75.7	18,586.6	18.58
TOTAL for Bishopric Chapter		45.7	11,232.9	11.23
TOTAL GENERAL		121.5	29,831.8	29.83

SOURCES: *DIR, C. Transilvania, XIV*, vol. III (1331–1340), doc. 56, pp. 122–157; *MVH, I, I*, doc. 3, pp. 91–98.

Beyond the discrepancies mentioned above in connection to the structure of the Transylvanian archdeaconries, Table 1 shows that the largest archdeaconry of the Bishopric of Transylvania was that of Alba, a size that was commensurate with the financial might of this diocesan subunit. Alba was followed by Ozd and Dăbâca, both significantly wealthy judging by the number of parishes listed in the papal register. The archdeaconries of Turda, Târnava, and Tylegd²⁶ constituted a third tier in the hierarchy based on the number of parishes. The other archdeaconries were relatively equal, the records kept by Jacobus Berengarii and Raimundus de Bonofato showing no significant difference between the number of parishes and their financial situation.

Consequently, on the basis of the tithe register, for the first year of tax collecting (1332) we could identify, in structural terms, 388 parishes, and a total paid amount of 121.5 marks (approx. 30 kg of silver).

For the second year of tax collecting (Table 2), we see a decrease in the amounts paid in tithe as well as in the number of identified parishes. Even if in some arch-

deaconries we see an increase in the number of parishes identified for the second year, this increase does not translate into an increase in the amounts collected. On the contrary, in the concrete case of the archdeaconry of Tylegd,²⁷ from 40 parishes in the first year we move to 60 in the second year, but the total amount paid by these parishes is much lower than that of the previous year. We believe this was also caused by the more modest economic situation of the parishes belonging to the archdeaconry of Tylegd. Additional factors may also have been responsible for this, especially the local temporal ones such as the voivode of Transylvania, who could have somehow caused a decrease in the amounts collected.

There is no concrete evidence to substantiate such a claim, but it remains a possibility, considering that Pope John XXII had to repeat his request that the local temporal leaders lend their support to his two tax collectors. The Holy See was trying to mobilize not just the spiritual factors, but also the temporal ones.²⁸ The papal exhortations were reiterated on several occasions, suggesting that the local response to the requests of the Holy See had not been the expected one.²⁹

TABLE 2. PARISHES AND TITHES IDENTIFIED
FOR THE YEAR OF PAYMENT 1333 (SECOND YEAR)

Archdeaconry	Number of identified parishes	Amounts identified (in Buda silver marks)	Weight of identified marks (g)	Equivalent of marks in kilograms of silver
Turda	17	1.60	405.1	0.40
Alba	54	5.50	1,350.4	1.35
Ozd	45	4.10	1,018.9	1.01
Hunedoara	1	0.10	24.5	0.02
Cojocna	27	6.30	1,546.8	1.54
Târnavă	1	0.08	19.6	0.02
Tylegd	60	1.10	282.3	0.28
Dăbâca	24	1.90	466.5	0.46
Szolnok	17	1.80	441.9	0.44
Kézdi	10	0.07	17.1	0.01
Satu Mare	17	1.10	270.0	0.27
TOTAL for 11 archdeaconries (Crasna and Ugocsa are missing)	273	23.70	5,819.0	5.81
TOTAL for Bishopric Chapter		14.90	3,658.3	3.65
TOTAL GENERAL		38.60	9,477.4	9.47

SOURCES: *DIR, C. Transilvania, XIV*, vol. III (1331–1340), doc. 56, pp. 159–173; *EO, II* (1301–1339), doc. 1061, p. 385.

According to Table 2, for the second year of tax collecting (1333) we identified approximately 273 parishes belonging to 11 Transylvanian archdeaconries, which paid a tithe of approximately 23.7 silver marks. If we add the amounts paid by the chapter of the bishopric (14.9 marks) we come to a total of 38.6 marks (9.47 kg of silver). There are considerable differences between the first and the second year of tithe collecting: for the second year, the number of listed parishes decreases by 115, and the total collected amount goes down by 83 marks, the equivalent of 20.5 kg of silver. It is therefore possible that the local temporal factors played a negative role in the collection of the tithe in the Bishopric of Transylvania.

The situation becomes much more complicated in the third year of collection (*Regestrum solutionis decimarum tertii anni in vigilia omnium sanctorum Anno Domini MCCCXXXIV*),³⁰ and there is no possibility to make a distinction between archdeaconries, because those who paid the tithe are listed in a continuing manner, regardless of the administrative limits of the Transylvanian episcopal units to which they belonged. In other words, the entries are limited to the names of the contributors and the amounts paid. In fact, this must have been the most important element for the Apostolic Chamber, which compiled the fiscal records: the amounts paid.

The register then lumps together the amounts collected in several archdeaconries such as Dăbâca,³¹ Turda, Cojocna, Ugocsa, Alba, Satu Mare, Ozd, Szolnok, Târnava, where the 45 identified parishes paid to the sub-collectors the equivalent of 7.3 marks. This once again shows the unsystematic nature of their record-keeping, especially for the third year, when 46 parishes belonging to several archdeaconries paid nearly 11 silver marks. The same inconsistency applies to the third case, when an equal number of parishes paid the equivalent of more than 10 silver marks, in assorted currencies.

The total amount identified for the first semester of the third year of collecting stands at 102.2 silver marks,³² 186 parishes being listed for this semester.

We believed that the somewhat chaotic record-keeping is also caused by the context, as this (1334) was the year when Raimundus de Bonofato, who coordinated the collection of taxes in the western part of the Kingdom of Hungary, passed away. This might have stirred in Jacobus Berengarii the desire to assume full responsibility for the collection of tithes throughout the entire Kingdom of Hungary.

The inconsistent record-keeping seen in the tithe register for the Bishopric of Transylvania and in other cases as well could also have been caused by the hastiness of those who compiled the fiscal record under the coordination of Jacobus Berengarii, whom the Holy See suspected of fraud. Fraud could also have been

the reason why the register for the first semester of 1334 was drawn up in such a superficial manner.

POPE JOHN XXII sent another collector, Jacobus de Lingris, to replace the one who had passed away. The quick measures taken by the Curia in the matter of tithe collecting had a beneficial influence upon the entries concerning the second semester of 1334.³³

We identified more than 360 parishes which, in the second semester of the year 1334, paid approximately 51 silver marks, the same amount as in the first semester, even if in the first semester there had been considerably fewer parishes. In the second semester of that year, the Chapter paid 42 marks, 9 marks less than in the first payment. The amount identified for the second semester of the third year stands at 93 marks, and the total identifiable for the year 1334 is of 195.2 marks³⁴ (47.9 kg of silver).

The entries for the fourth year (1335) begin with the amount paid by the members of the Chapter, namely, 33 marks. Our recalculation, however, led to an identifiable amount of only 23 marks, the missing 10 marks having to do with the numerous gaps in the text.³⁵

The gaps make it difficult to determine the number of parishes and the amounts paid. Nevertheless, according to the calculations, for the year 1335 we could identify approximately 200 parishes. For the aforementioned reasons, the tithe collected in the fourth year reaches nearly 119 marks: 25.5 marks paid by the parishes + 33 marks paid by the Chapter = 58.5 marks, to which we add the 60.5 marks brought in by the sub-collectors, for a grand total of 118.8 marks (29.1 kg of silver).

In the fifth and last year of collecting (1336),³⁶ the entries end abruptly after the unsystematic listing of only 24 parishes belonging to several archdeaconries. The tithes paid by the 24 parishes in question amounted to nearly 9 marks (8.7 marks = 2.1 kg of silver).

The tithe register for the Bishopric of Transylvania, drawn up under the supervision of head collector Jacobus Berengarii, ends with the entries concerning the amounts paid by the parishes of the Sibiu Prepositure³⁷ which, from an institutional point of view, had no obligations to the Bishopric of Transylvania and which, since the creation of the Saxon Prepositure (1191), had been directly subordinated to Rome, or indeed to the Holy See. They may have been included in this register because, geographically speaking, the Saxon Prepositure was located in Transylvania, and the tithe register included entries concerning this region. The fiscal records indicate that in the 1330s the Sibiu Prepositure had 27 parishes, which paid 4.3 marks to the collectors (1 kg of silver).

According to this source, the total amount collected in the region by the envoys of Avignon (without the tithes paid by the holder of the diocesan see) stood at 665.8 marks (163.5 kg of silver). If we deduct the 4.3 marks (1 kg of silver) paid in tithe by the Sibiu Prepositure, then the 13 archdeaconries of Transylvania paid 661.5 marks (162.4 kg of silver) to the Apostolic Chamber in Avignon. The same register shows that over the five years the bishop of Transylvania paid a tithe of 1170 marks (287.3 kg of silver).

If we put together the tithes paid by the archdeaconries and the local bishop, it emerges that the total amount collected in Transylvania by Jacobus Berengarii, during the five years in question, was of 1831.5 marks (449.7 kg of silver).

If we consider the amount indicated by the source, 661.5 marks (162.4 kg of silver) as the total of the tithes paid by the 13 archdeaconries, then the 483 marks (118.6 kg of silver) (Table 3) identified by us would amount to 73% of the total, with a difference of 178.5 marks (43.8 kg of silver), meaning 27% of the total. This difference of nearly 180 stems from the numerous gaps in the text.

The percentage is higher if we factor in the amount paid by the bishop of Transylvania: 1,170 marks (287.3 kg). Thus: 661.5 marks (source text) + 1,170 marks = 1,831.5 marks (449.7 kg) = 100%; 483 marks (identified by us) + 1,170 marks = 1,653 marks (405.9 kg of silver) = 90.25%. In this case the difference of 178.5 marks (43.8 kg) would only represent 9.75% of the total.

TABLE 3. PARISHES AND TITHES IDENTIFIED
FOR FIVE YEARS OF PAYMENT (1332–1336)

Year of payment	Number of identified parishes	Amounts identified (in Buda silver marks)	Weight of identified marks (g)	Equivalent of marks in kilograms of silver
First year (1332)	388	121.5	29,831.8	29.83
Second year (1333)	273	38.6	9,477.4	9.47
Third year (1334)	360	195.2	47,927.4	47.92
Fourth year (1335)	200	118.8	29,168.9	29.16
Fifth year (1336)	24	8.7	2,136.1	2.13
TOTAL FIVE YEARS	1,245	483.0	118,591.0	118.59

SOURCES: *EO*, II (1301–1339), doc. 1060–1154, pp. 385–418; *DIR*, XIV, C, *Transilvania*, vol. III (1331–1340), doc. 56, pp. 122–221.

The amounts presented above (Table 3) are intended to provide, as much as possible, a complete estimate of the amounts collected in tithe in the archdeaconries belonging to the Bishopric of Transylvania between 1332 and 1336. In most cases the amounts could be identified but, given the gaps present in various places in the text, the identification rate stands at 90.25% if we also factor in the tithes paid during the period in question by the bishop of Transylvania. Without the 1,170 marks paid by the local bishop, the identification rate goes down to 73%.

The 1,831.5 marks collected in the Bishopric of Transylvania between 1332 and 1337 account for 19.5% of the total amount collected in the Kingdom of Hungary (9,385 marks³⁸ = 2,304.3 kg or 2.3 tons of silver). However, one third of the total amount went to King Charles Robert of Anjou,³⁹ amounting to 3,130 Buda marks (768 kg of silver), while the other two thirds were sent to the Apostolic Chamber in Avignon (1,536 kg or 1.53 tons of silver).

The data presented here demonstrate that the system of papal tithes also led to the institutional territorialization⁴⁰ of the parishes located on the eastern fringes of *Societas Christiana*, more precisely, in Transylvania. This came to illustrate the theory formulated by Pope Innocent III on the universal *dominium* of the Latin Church, a theory that was also enacted in the canons adopted by the Fourth Lateran Council of 1215 (Canons 53–54).

□

(Translated by BOGDAN ALDEA)

Notes

- Adinel C. Dincă, “Vicarii generali ai episcopului Transilvaniei în secolul al XIV-lea,” *Anuarul Institutului de Istorie “G. Barițiu” din Cluj-Napoca* 47 (2008): 29–42; id., “Antroponimie și etnie în Transilvania medievală (Epoca angevină),” *Anuarul Institutului de Istorie “G. Barițiu” din Cluj-Napoca* 51 (2012): 31–43; Mihai-Florin Hasan, “Antroponimia clerului din registrul de dijme pontificale pe șase ani [1332–1337] cu privire la Transilvania,” *Acta Musei Napocensis* (Cluj-Napoca), 47/II (2010): 61–79; Șerban Turcuș, “Antroponimele teoforice în Transilvania în secolele XI–XIV,” *Anuarul Institutului de Istorie “G. Barițiu” din Cluj-Napoca* 50 (2011): 15–27; Victor V. Vizauer, “Transylvanian Anthropotoponymy in the Pontifical Tithes Register for Six Years (1332–1337),” *Transylvanian Review* 21, Supplement no. 3 (2012): 303–320; Răzvan Mihai Neagu, *Politica beneficală a papalității de la Avignon în Transilvania (1305–1378)* (Cluj-Napoca, 2013), passim; Géza Hegyi, “Egyházigazgatási határok a középkori Erdélyben (I. közlemény),” in *Erdélyi Digitális Adattár*, <http://eda.eme.ro/handle/10598/25970>, accessed on 28.08.2014.
- Jakó Zsigmond, *Erdélyi okmánytár* (hereafter cited as *EO*), II, doc. 695, p. 257; *Documente privind istoria României, Veacul XIV, C. Transilvania* (hereafter cited as *DIR, C. Transilvania*, XIV), vol. III, doc. 12, pp. 6–7. The document provides information about the two collectors: Jacobus Berengarii belonged to the Benedictine order and

- was the steward of the monastery in Grasse. Raimundus de Bonofato was parish priest in St. Michael's Chapel of the dioceses of Carcassonne and Limoges, in France.
3. It is assumed that the papal tithes began to be collected in the Kingdom of Hungary sometime in the year 1216, during the pontificate of Honorius III, the successor of Innocent III. The precise data are lacking, as no records survive in regard to this collection. The assumptions are based on the fact that in 1217, one year after the collection of the tithe, Honorius III corresponded on this matter with the Hungarian high clergy. The next collection of tithes took place in the 1270s, Gerardus de Mutina receiving the mandate for this in 1275. The register drawn up by Gerardus de Mutina is still in existence, and it is very valuable for it records the total amounts collected in the Kingdom of Hungary. However, the entries did not reflect the structure of the local Church in Hungary, as the amounts were not grouped according to the relevant archdeaconries and then bishoprics, and therefore cannot be used to determine what was collected in Transylvania. The most complex register that indicates the amounts paid by the Transylvanian prelates is the one drawn up by Jacobus Berengarii and Raimundus de Bonofato in the 1330s.
 4. According to Michel Lauwers, a parish is a set of interpersonal relations (sacramental and material) between the parish priest and each of the parishioners, while relations between parishioners are mediated by the priest. Michel Lauwers, "Pour une histoire de la dîme et du *Dominium* Ecclésial," in *La dîme, l'Église et la société féodale* (Turnhout, 2012), Collection d'études médiévales de Nice, vol. 12, pp. 13–70.
 5. For details regarding the collection of tithes in the Kingdom of Poland, see: http://www.wbc.poznan.pl/Content/20067/kw_02.html, accessed on 14.03.2015. *Codex Diplomaticus Maioris Polonia Documenta, et iam Typis Descripta, et adhuc Inedita Complectens, Annum 1400 Attingentia*, Editus cura Societatis Literariae Poznaniensis, Tomus II, Comprehendit Numeros 617–1292, Annos 1299–1349 (Poznaniae, 1878).
 6. Eugène Müntz, "Le luxe à la cour pontificale d'Avignon," *Comptes rendus des séances de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres* (Paris) 41 (1897): 29–32; J.-P. Kirsch, "La fiscalité pontificale dans les diocèses de Lausanne, Genève et Sion à la fin du XIII^{me} et au XIV^{eme} siècle," *Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique suisse* (Zurich) 2 (1908): 102–113; M. Fougères, "Problèmes de transfert: la papauté d'Avignon et ses banquiers," *Mélanges d'histoire sociale* (Paris) 4 (1943): 78–80; Jean Favier, "Temporels ecclésiastiques et taxation fiscale: le poids de la fiscalité pontificale au XIV^e siècle," *Journal des savants* (Paris, 1964): 102–127; Jean-Daniel Morerod, "Taxation décimale et frontières politiques en France aux XIII^e et XIV^e siècles," in *Aux origines de l'État moderne: Le fonctionnement administratif de la Papauté d'Avignon. Actes de la table ronde d'Avignon (23–24 janvier 1988)* (Rome, 1990), 329–350; Bernard Barbiche, "Les procureurs des rois de France à la cour pontificale d'Avignon," in *Aux origines de l'État moderne*, 81–112; Amandine Le Roux, "Mise en place des collecteurs et des collectories dans le royaume de France et en Provence (1316–1378)," *Lusitania Sacra* (Lisbon) 22 (2010): 45–62; id., "De l'espace diocésain et provincial à la collectorie: une gestion territoriale des espaces fiscaux pontificaux en Lorraine du XIII^e au XV^e siècle?" *Annales de l'Est*, 7th ser., 63, 2 (2013): 127–157; Mário Farelo, "Les clercs étrangers au Portugal durant la période de la papauté avignonnaise: un aperçu préliminaire," *Lusitania Sacra* 22 (2010): 85–147.

7. Paolo Prodi, *Forme storiche di governo nella Chiesa universale* (Bologna, 2003), 7–8.
8. Lauwers, “Pour une histoire de la dîme,” 13–70. In a broad sense, the tithe is an expression of the ecclesiastical territorialization occurred during the Middle Ages. Apart from being the payment in cash or in kind of the contribution universally demanded by the ecclesiastical authorities, the tithe was also devised as an essential agent of the ecclesiastical and social institutional territorialization of the Church. Thus, the tithe acquires a dimension of universality. The first stage of this universality occurred during the Gregorian reformation, when the tithe, or rather its payment, defined the Christian man as God’s faithful. Pope Innocent III (1198–1216) tuned the tithe into a “symbol of the universal *dominium* of God.” Universal *dominium* meant that the tithe came before any other tax, and by paying it the believers accepted to be in the *dominium*, while those who refused to pay could be excommunicated. Canons 53–54, adopted at the Fourth Lateran Council of 1215, chaired by Innocent III, regulated the matter of papal tithes (. . . *Cum autem in signum uniuersalis domini, quasi quodam titulo speciali, sibi Dominus decimas reseruauerit, nos et ecclesiarum dispendiis et animarum periculis obuiare uolentes, statuimus ut in praerogatiua domini generalis exactionem tributorum et censuum praecedat solutio decimarum, uel saltem hi ad quos census et tributa indecimata peruenerint. . .*). Jacques Paul Migne, “Innocentii III Romani Pontificis opera omnia,” in *Patrologiae*, Tomus Secundus (Paris, 1855). We must not forget that the decisions in question were grounded in the Bible and were not an innovation of Innocent III. See the Bible, *Genesis* 14:20/28:22. “and this stone, which I have set up for a pillar, shall be God’s house. And of all that you give me I will give a full tenth to you.”
9. “Hierocracy” is the generic term that historically defines the period of the 12th–14th centuries, during which the Curia acted in the fashion of an empire, bringing under its temporal authority most of the kingdoms in Europe. In a broad sense, hierocracy would mean “ecclesiastical government,” or indeed government by the Roman Church, an institution that led Europe in the manner of a monarchy during the 12th–14th centuries. The main feature of hierocracy was centralization, which reached institutional maturity towards the end of the 12th century, during the pontificate of Innocent III. Walter Ullmann, *The Growth of Papal Government in The Middle Ages* (London, 1962), 1–25; James M. Powell, *Innocent III—Vicar of Christ or Lord of the World?* (Washington, 1994), 79–156; Edward Peters, “Lotario dei Conti di Segni becomes Pope Innocent III: The Man and the Pope,” in *Pope Innocent III and His World*, ed. John C. Moore (Brookfield, 1999), 3–24.
10. Maurice Faucon, “Les arts à la cour d’Avignon sous Clément V et Jean XXII (1307–1334),” *Mélanges d’archéologie et d’histoire* (Paris), 2 (1882): 36–83; *ibid.*, *Mélanges d’archéologie et d’histoire* 4 (1884): 57–130; Yves Renouard, *La Papauté à Avignon* (Paris, 2004), 99–105.
11. A part of the money collected by the Apostolic Chamber for the crusade was allocated to other actions, such as those targeting the heretics and the schismatics, the various wars waged in the Italian peninsula, and the construction of the papal palace in Avignon.
12. Augusto Vasina, “Il papato Avignonese e il Governo dello Stato della Chiesa,” in *Aux origines de l’État moderne*, 135–150; Pierre Gasnault, “L’élaboration des lettres secrètes des papes d’Avignon: Chambre et Chancellerie,” in *Aux origines de l’État*

- moderne*, 209–222; *Storia del Cristianesimo*, eds. Ch. Pietri, L. Pietri, A. Vauchez, M. Venard, and J. M. Mayeur, Italian edition by Giuseppe Alberigo, vol. 6, *Un tempo di prove 1274–1449* (Rome, 1998), 62–63, 68–71.
13. Kristjan Toomaspoeg, *Decimae: il sostegno economico dei sovrani alla Chiesa del Mezzogiorno nel XIII secolo: dai lasciti di Eduard Sthamer e Norbert Kamp* (Rome, 2009); Thomas Asbridge, *The Crusades: The Authoritative History of the War for the Holy Land* (New York: Ecco, 2011).
 14. The two collectors sent by Avignon divided up the territory assigned to them, as follows: Raimundus de Bonofato, based in Archbishopric of Esztergom, coordinated the collection of tithes in the western part of the Kingdom of Hungary. This area included the bishoprics of Agria, Pécs, Vác, Győr, Nyitra, and Veszprém, all subordinated to the Archbishopric of Esztergom. The other papal tax collector, Jacobus Berengarii, operated out of Kalocsa, the archbishopric that subordinated the diocese of Transylvania as well as the other bishoprics, of Oradea, Csanád, Zagreb, and Bosnia. Each head collector had his sub-collectors. For the collection of tithes in the Bishopric of Transylvania, Jacobus Berengarii was assisted by a number of sub-collectors (Thomas, a custodian of the Church in Transylvania, and Archdeacons John and Benedict), who actually interacted with the people who paid the tithe. György Rácz, “Az Anjou-ház es a Szentszék 1301–1387,” in *Magyarország és a Szentszék kapcsolatának ezer éve* (Budapest, 1996), 55–64; *Storia del Cristianesimo*, 729–732.
 15. *DIR, C. Transilvania*, XIV, vol. III (1331–1340) (Bucharest: Ed. Academiei Române, 1954), doc. 56, pp. 122–219.
 16. *Monumenta Vaticana Hungariae*, Series I, Tome I, *Rationes collectorum Pontificiarum. Pápai tizedszedők számadásai 1281–1375* (hereafter cited as *MVH*, I, I) (Budapest, 2000), doc. 3, pp. 90–144.
 17. *EO*, II (1301–1339) (Budapest, 2004), doc. 1060–1154, pp. 385–418.
 18. Coriolan Suciú, *Dicționar istoric al localităților din Transilvania*, 2 vols. (Bucharest, 1967), *passim*.
 19. *DIR*, XIV, C, *Transilvania*, vol. III (1331–1340), doc. 9, p. 4. For information regarding Pope John XXII, see: Guillaume Mollat, “Jean XXII et Charles IV le Bel (1322–1328)” [Auguste Coulon et Suzanne Clémencet, *Lettres secrètes et curiales de Jean XXII* (Bibliothèque des Écoles françaises d’Athènes et de Rome)], *Journal des savants* (Paris, 1967), 92–106; *id.*, “L’élection du pape Jean XXII,” *Revue d’histoire de l’Église de France* 1, 2 (1910): 147–166; August Franzen, *Istoria papilor*, transl. Romulus Pop (Bucharest, 1996), 255–260.
 20. *DIR*, XIV, C, *Transilvania*, vol. III (1331–1340), *passim*. The calculations are estimative and intended to approximate the various currencies listed in the tithe register. As a matter of fact, the collectors themselves recorded the final amounts in marks. In other words, they as well converted the coins collected in tithe in order to have a total amount they could report to the Curia, or indeed to the Apostolic Chamber, the department in charge of the finances of *Societas Christiana*.
 21. *MVH*, I, I, doc. 3, pp. 90–91. “*Notandum, quod in primis de archidiaconatu de Thorda de solutione medietatis decimarum primi anni in dominica esto michi dominus Petrus sacerdos de Thorda ad manus magistrorum Benedicti archidiaconi de Tylegd et Thome*

- custodis ecclesie Transsilvane solvit...*” *EO*, II (1301–1339), doc. 1147–1151, pp. 316–417; *DIR*, *C. Transilvania*, XIV, vol. III (1331–1340), doc. 56, p. 122.
22. *EO*, II. (1301–1339), doc. 1075–1079, pp. 391–393.
23. *MVH*, I, I, doc. 3, pp. 91–98; *DIR*, *C. Transilvania*, XIV, vol. III (1331–1340), doc. 56, p. 136.
24. *DIR*, *C. Transilvania*, XIV, vol. III (1331–1340), doc. 56, pp. 122–158. First installment: archdeaconry (hereafter a.) of Turda—27 parishes = 2.7 marks; a. of Alba—38 parishes = 2.8 marks; a. of Ozd—43 parishes = 3.9 marks; deaneries of Sebeş and Orăştie – Alba—28 parishes = 6.7 marks; a. of Hunedoara—8 parishes = 1.1 marks; a. of Cojocna—16 parishes = 2.6 marks; deanery of Spring—13 parishes = 1.25 marks; a. of Târnava—33 parishes = 2 marks; a. of Tylegd—40 parishes = 1.75 marks; deanery of Bistriţa—a. of Dăbâca—16 parishes = 2.5 marks; a. of Szolnok—1 parish = 0.2 marks; a. of Crasna—1 parish = 0.16 marks etc. Second installment: a. of Alba—37 parishes = 4.8 marks; a. of Dăbâca—31 parishes = 3.1 marks; deanery of Sebeş—a. of Alba—20 parishes = 9.8 marks; a. of Ozd—2 parishes = 0.5 marks; a. of Turda—32 parishes = 2 marks; a. of Târnava—36 parishes = 2.3 marks; a. of Cojocna—20 parishes = 2.7 marks; a. of Tylegd—5 parishes = 0.5 marks; deanery of Bistriţa—a. of Dăbâca—9 parishes = 3.25 marks; a. of Szolnok—16 parishes = 1.25 marks; deanery of Reghin (Szászrégen)—a. Ozd—15 parishes = 2.7 marks etc., plus the Bishopric Chapter, which paid 45.75 marks in the first year.
25. There is no data on the number of rural habitats needed for a parish in the 14th century.
26. *EO*, II (1301–1339), doc. 1138–1146, pp. 412–415.
27. Suciu, *passim*.
28. *DIR*, *C. Transilvania*, XIV, vol. III (1331–1340), doc. 76, pp. 262–263.
29. Bernard Guillemain, “Papauté d’Avignon et Etat moderne,” in *Papauté, monarchisme et théories politiques: études d’histoire médiévale offertes à Marcel Pacaut*, eds. P. Guichard, M.-T. Lorcin, J.-M. Poisson, and M. Rubellin, vol. 1, *Le pouvoir et l’institution ecclésiastique* (Lyon, 1994), 79–89.
30. *MVH*, I, I, doc. 3, pp. 118–134; *DIR*, *C. Transilvania*, XIV, vol. III (1331–1340), doc. 56, pp. 174–204.
31. *EO*, II (1301–1339), doc. 1066–1074, pp. 387–390.
32. In the archdeaconry of Szolnok, 18 parishes paid tithes whose total was the equivalent of one silver mark. In the archdeaconry of Cojocna, an equal number of 18 parishes paid 3.9 marks; the 24 parishes in the archdeaconry of Turda paid to the sub-collectors approximately 2.7 silver marks. In the archdeaconry of Dăbâca the equivalent of 8.4 marks was paid by 29 parishes, and in the archdeaconry of Ozd 18 parishes paid 1.9 marks. The amounts were relatively higher than those collected in the archdeaconry of Tylegd, where approximately 86 parishes paid only 1.2 marks. As a matter of fact, many of its parishes contributed modest amounts, indicating the poor economic situation of the eastern archdeaconry. In the archdeaconry of Satu Mare, approximately 25 parishes paid to the Apostolic Chamber tithes amounting to 2.9 marks, while in the archdeaconry of Ugocsa 19 parishes paid the equivalent of 2 silver marks. *DIR*, *C. Transilvania*, XIV, vol. III (1331–1340), doc. 56, pp. 174–204.
33. *EO*, II (1301–1339), doc. 1062–1063, pp. 385–386.

34. *DIR, C. Transylvania, XIV*, vol. III (1331–1340), doc. 56, pp. 174–204.
35. *MVH, I, I*, doc. 3, pp. 135; *DIR, C. Transylvania, XIV*, vol. III (1331–1340), doc. 56, pp. 205–218.
36. *MVH, I, I*, doc. 3, pp. 142–144; *DIR, C. Transylvania, XIV*, vol. III (1331–1340), doc. 56, pp. 218–219.
37. *EO, II (1301–1339)*, doc. 1133, p. 410; *DIR, C. Transylvania, XIV*, vol. III (1331–1340), doc. 56, pp. 219–221.
38. *MVH, I, I*, doc. 3, p. 401. “*Summa summarum totius libri de pecuniis, receptis per dominum Jacobum Berengarii collectorem et alios subcollectores suos ac dominum Raimundum de Bonofato similiter collectorem, facit novem milia CCC. et LXXXV. marcas cum dimidia ad compotum Budensem computando...*”
39. *DIR, XIV, C, Transylvania*, vol. III (1331–1340), doc. 90–92, pp. 270–271. King Charles Robert requested and obtained from Pope John XXII, through his envoy Paul, the bishop of Belgrade, one third of the papal tithes that were to be collected by the papal representatives in the Kingdom of Hungary over a period of six years.
40. Michel Lauwers, “*Territorium non facere diocesim: Conflits, limites et représentation territoriale du diocèse, V–XIII^e siècle,*” in *L’espace du diocèse: Genèse d’un territoire dans l’Occident médiéval (V^e–XIII^e siècle)*, ed. Florian Mazel (Rennes, 2008), 23–65.

Abstract

Historical-Economic Aspects Pertaining to the Bishopric of Transylvania as Reflected in the Pontifical Tithe Register (1332–1337)

The paper analyzes, from a historical-economic point of view, the tithe register (1332–1337) compiled by tax collectors Jacobus Berengarii and Raimundus de Bonofato, envoys of Pope John XXII, for at least two reasons: firstly, it has never been analyzed in order to determine the main rationale behind the register, which was economic in nature; secondly, because this register is structurally more complex than the other registers drawn up by the tax collectors active in the Kingdom of Hungary before 1331. We provide an inventory of parishes and an estimate of the overall financial situation at the level of their archdeaconry, in order to see what were, throughout the whole of Transylvania, the tithes paid by the clergymen of the Bishopric of Transylvania to the Apostolic Chamber of Avignon, between 1332 and 1337. The amounts collected can be identified in most cases, but given the various gaps in the register the rate of identification stands at 90.25%, if we also factor in the amounts paid in tithe during the period in question by the bishop of Transylvania. Without the 1,170 marks paid by the local bishop, the rate of identification of the amounts paid decreases to 73%. The total amount collected by the Bishopric of Transylvania between 1332 and 1337, calculated in Buda silver marks, stood at 1,831.5 marks (the equivalent of roughly 450 kilograms of silver) and represented 19.5% of the total amount collected in the Kingdom of Hungary (9,385 marks = 2.3 tons of silver). However, of the 9,385 marks, one third went to King Charles Robert of Anjou, namely, 3,130 Buda marks (758 kilograms of silver), while the other two thirds were sent to the Apostolic Chamber in Avignon (1,536 kg, or 1.53 tons of silver).

Keywords

Transylvania, parishes, archdeaconries, bishopric, tax collectors, tithes, silver marks