Nobiliary Residences and *Ius Patronatus* in the Territory between the Timiş Rivers

(14th–16th centuries)

ZSUZSANNA KOPECZNY

> "*. . .ob remedium animarum eorum,*
> *parentumque suorum ob salutem, ecclesie . . .*
> *site seu constitute commisissent. . .*"
> Pesty Frigyes, *Oklevelek Temesmegye és Temesvárváros történetéhez*,
> ed. Ortvay Tivadar, I, (Pozsony, 1896), 49 (no. 32).

IN THE present study, we undertake an approach that falls within the thematic scope of our research on nobiliary residences from the territory between the two Timiş Rivers (the northern plain area of the Banat),[1] and we attempt to capture, to the extent to which the documentary sources allow us, the religious component of these domanial structures, with all its implications: architectural forms, canon law, their topography within the domains, etc. Such an approach has already been undertaken for fortresses.[2] The monographs and the repertories including ecclesiastical institutions are limited to mentioning their founders, where this information is known,[3] and some references to the subject have also been made in more recent studies on ecclesiastical history.[4] The subject of the monasteries founded by the great nobility, the so-called kindred monasteries characteristic of the 11th–13th centuries, has nonetheless been widely debated,[5] and studies have also been written about churches under the patronage of urban communities, with references to some cases from our space.[6]

Following the example of kings, as great founders of monasteries, noblemen also resorted, depending on their material resources, to this gesture, meant to ensure the immortality of the souls of the founding patrons, their families and their descendants.

We discuss here both the founding of monasteries or the building of churches and cases of reconstructions, repair works or the endowment of churches with objects of cult necessary for conducting the Liturgy, property donations, etc. From the point of view of ecclesiastical organization, these foundations were intertwined with the network of parish churches, being usually subjected to the authority in whose territorial jurisdiction they were located. As is well known, the Holy King Stephen I ordered the construction of one church for every ten villages, laying down the rules for their maintenance.[7] Unfortunately, due to the lack of documentary information, we do not have a very clear idea about how quickly this ecclesiastical organization spread in the area that interests us. We do know, however, thanks to the registers of papal tithes compiled between 1332 and 1337, that in the first half of the 14th century, the number of Catholic parishes in the Diocese of Cenad was around 200, 86 of which operated in the Archdeaconry of Timiş.[8] The initial state, in which a church served the worship needs of a rather scattered community, proved insufficient and cumbersome, given the distances that had to be travelled and the road conditions in wetlands, especially during the rainy season, in times of war and so on. That is why new parishes were created, with full or partial rights (daughter-houses, chapels), the above-mentioned causes being often listed among the initiators' motivations.[9] An important role in this regard was played by the owners of estates, whether they were great aristocrats and high officials of the kingdom or members of the small and middle nobility, as we shall see below.

During the 14th–16th centuries, the great majority of the parishes on the territory of the Kingdom of Hungary were, in one way or another, under secular or ecclesiastical patronage and the offices of parish priests in the churches with higher incomes were coveted even by the high dignitaries.[10] This also applies to the area we are examining here.[11] Drawing a parallel between the founding of monasteries and that of churches, we must also take into account the argument that, by establishing churches, the nobles resorted to a manner of increasing their revenue or, in the spirit of *ius presentandi*, they sought to provide some of their family members with a source of living that was most often not very modest.[12]

The church or the chapel itself also represented a material value, as clearly reflected in the wording of the documents. When estates were sold or donated together with the religious edifices built on their land, the references to their material endowment and appearance were designed to provide data that could help assess these goods. They generally referred to the number of towers,[13] the raw material of which they were made and their condition.

Given their structural solidity, the towers and the entire building implicitly served a defensive military purpose. This idea is relevant especially for the 11th–13th centuries, when the nobility had no fortresses,[14] but it also applies to the late Middle Ages, especially in the case of the more modest members of the nobility. Churches could be considered, in the event of attacks, the place of refuge for the locals, as was the case of the Cuman uprising from 1280, when Toma, the son of *Comes* Pancraţiu from the Cenad kin, locked himself in the church from Tömörkény, where he hid the documents concerning his family's land patrimony.[15] Mention has been made and we might be tempted to speak about the category of fortified churches from the territory of the Banat, too.[16] However, things

are still rather unclear even though the political and military realities in the area (the Turkish incursions) could be an argument in this regard. We should recall the example from Iobag, where the documents say there was a fortification around the church.[17] Some of these "fortified" churches most likely belonged to residential complexes,[18] as archaeological research has shown even in the southern Banat, at Berzovia, Ilidia-Obliţa[19] or Reşiţa-Moroasa.[20] This must also have been the case of Iobag, where we know that the voivodes of Transylvania ordered that the castles belonging to Nicolae Treutul should be destroyed: Obad, Iobag and Jebel. The documentary data are quite clear as regards the church of Opatiţa, which had a wooden wall whose repair was initiated in 1452 by the local nobles because of the Turkish raids.[21] The quality of patrons is not clearly evinced by the aforementioned deed, nor do other documents bring solid arguments in this regard. The existence of a church inside the fortified enclosure is attested archeologically and indirectly, through the presence of the necropolis.[22] Churches with elements of defense around them (palisades and/ or moats) have also been found at Ilidia-Cetate[23] and at Mănăştiur.[24] Given the rather limited area of research, what remains to be clarified is their precise chronological relationship with the places of worship and their functionality: there exists the possibility that in some cases, the abandoned buildings were reused for military purposes,[25] a situation imposed by the permanent Ottoman threat in the area, from the late 14th century on, as mentioned in the case of Opatiţa. Furthermore, the equipment of the church, or rather the cemetery, with a moat, a fence (palisade) or a wall was not unusual; in fact, the delineation of the holy space was imposed by the Catholic canons.[26]

In another order of ideas, the founding documents also had a symbolic valence, since like fortresses and castles, they contributed to increasing the authority of the noble founder. This endeavor could materialize in the architecture and spatial organization of the church: the placement of coats of arms carved in stone on the church façade, the sculpting of niches or box pews at the west end of the church, whence the noble family could listen to the religious ceremony.[27] Here we should also mention the frescoes, whose representations sometimes included the founding scenes and inscriptions that are invaluable, in the absence of documentary information, for dating the construction or the repair works and for establishing the identity of the founders. Unfortunately, in the area we have investigated, the religious buildings have been almost completely destroyed and the archaeological excavations have been far too few to provide archaeological data on the issues mentioned above. This does not mean they did not exist. For now, all we can do is make reference to more or less close analogies. We can mention, in this respect, the churches with a box pew from Cladova[28] or Ilidia-Cetate.[29] Although no documentary data exist on the patronal institution of the church from Tauţ (Arad County), archaeological research has revealed planimetric elements that suggest such a reality (seating niches, a side chapel, sepulchers).[30] Examples of votive paintings can be found in Arad County, at Hălmagiu and Iermata,[31] or in the Land of Haţeg.[32] Of course, depending on the material possibilities, the visual expressions of the founder's power and generosity could take more modest forms. Because no material traces have been preserved in this sense, we can only imagine various possibilities, such as the display of the coat of arms on flags or on wood stands, or wooden pews being reserved for him and his family.

Besides the privilege of occupying a distinguished position in the church during his lifetime, a nobleman also enjoyed this prerogative after death. According to the Catholic

religious canons, burial was permitted only inside the parish church graveyard, but there was a possibility that in the case of newly founded churches or chapels, the initiators—in our case, the noblemen—could obtain the so-called *ius funerandi*[33] along with the right of establishment. This was actually one of the motivations for the construction of patronal churches: to serve as the final resting place of their families and entourage (even of their serfs or other inhabitants of the village).[34] The same purpose was served by the chapels, whether they were independent or adjacent to churches. The existence of a cemetery increased even more the material value of the buildings, so they were often mentioned in the deeds of donation or in the sale-purchase documents. According to the assessments included in Tripartitum, the value of a chapel with a burial ground was double (6–10 marks) compared to one that did not have such an advantage.[35] In the region we have studied, the Bobal family—which had an estate in the Voiteg area, whence they took their name, with a domanial center that had a fortified residence at *Vareleye*—also owned a funeral chapel built of wood. According to the document, the family members had their resting place here.[36] The document containing the inventory of the possessions owned by the family of Bobal and the family of Oszlár or Majos, some of them under joint ownership, reveals the fact that this chapel was only used by Mihai Bobal and his brother, while the stone church from Voiteg and the one in Teremia appeared to be jointly owned.

The role of the patronal church as a burial place is attested, this time, by archaeological research conducted at the Himfy family residence in Remetea, identified within the boundaries of Berzovia, on the northern bank of the Bârzava.[37] Here, the necropolis around the stone church has been investigated, and several horizons of interment have been identified, the first being related to the previous existence of a chapel, attested by the mention of a chaplain in the documents. The first such mention is not the one from 1406,[38] as previously thought, but goes back to a much earlier date, sometime around 1368.[39] In the beginning, during the time of Ban Benedict, the family most likely founded a chapel with limited rights (a funeral chapel or a court chapel), which was later rebuilt, as shown in the documents. The family's place of worship eventually became a parish church, the chaplain being replaced by a priest. This transformation took place sometime between 1406, when the family chaplain was last mentioned, and the first decade of the 15th century, in 1414 mention being made of the donation Ștefan Himfy had made to his parish church.[40] The document drafted by the inhabitants of the Hodoș village in 1368 shows that Ban Benedict wanted to impose his own chaplain as a priest in the parish church there, although the position was already occupied. This may have been an attempt he made, as *Comes* of Timiș and the representative of the royal authority, to impose himself—by proposing his own protégé—in the matter of the appointment of a priest in the worship place of a village that was under royal control and belonged to the domain of the city of Timișoara.[41] The document issued in 1406 betrays another state of conflict between the Himfy family and their chaplain, on the one hand, and the vice-archdeacon of Sebeș, under whose jurisdiction the church from Remetea lay, on the other: Caterina, the wife of the aforementioned Ștefan Himfy, reported the archdeacon to the Bishop of Cenad because he had ordered the confinement of the chaplain despite the freedoms their church (*nostra ecclesia*) had benefited from ever since the time of King Louis. Unfortunately, we have no data on the nature of these privileges, but we suspect, since reference was made to them, that they were related to the family's right of patronage, including probably

the right of interment and possibly also their exemption from the archdeacon's jurisdiction.[42] This would explain all the more the reaction of Ştefan Himfy's wife.

As evinced by the documents, the founding patrons enjoyed privileges, but they also had obligations to the churches they founded: they oversaw the maintenance and repair of the construction, the endowment of the church with objects of worship, the defense of the institution and those in their service, their representation in court, etc. Referring again to the Himfy family, in the first decades of the 15th century the documents mentioned a church (*ecclesia sua parohialis*) built at Remetea, to which Ştefan, the son of Petru Himfy (Benedict's brother) had donated several horses.[43] Sometime afterwards, in 1435, Emeric Himfy of Debrenthe requested the vice-*Comes* of Timiş relief from customs taxes on the grain prepared for sale by Ana, the widow of Emeric Himfy of Remetea, the gain being used to rebuild their parish church.[44] We learn that the church was, at that time, in a desolate state. The documents show that the family's place of worship was in the constant care of its members, across several generations. The episodic conflicts arising between the Himfy family and the other land owners in their neighborhood, initiated by either one or the other of the parties involved, resulted in their placement under general ecclesiastical interdict, prohibiting the celebration of services perhaps even in the churches on their estates.[45] The church whose intended restoration was signaled in the document of 1435 was perhaps destroyed during the very attacks on the estate.

Patrons also played the role of intermediaries in connection with the authorities to whose jurisdiction their church belonged, as well as with the papacy. The purposes at stake concerned especially obtaining advantages for the church and its parishioners, as well as indulgences, the right to organize pilgrimages, to acquire relics, etc. In 1358, Nicolae Laţcu requested Pope Innocent IV to grant exemptions and privileges to the churches he had built and endowed with assets, namely the Church of All Saints from Zadia, St. Mary's from *Aruahigh* and the Blessed Archangel Michael's and St. Nicholas's Churches from Sânnicolau, located in the Romanian area, some of the inhabitants having recently converted to the Catholic faith.[46] Two of the churches listed above, the ones from Zadia and Sânnicolau, lie south of the Mureş, while Aruahigh is north of it. The patron of the churches requested the right to place them under the authority of the Diocese of Transylvania or of Cenad, as he thought fit. The pope refused to grant this request, remanding the decision to the authority of the Archbishop of Calocea.[47] Among the demanded privileges, there was the right to retain the tithes entirely, delivering only a quarter thereof to the diocesan, which was against the custom.[48] Interestingly, these churches were mentioned as being parochial, and therefore possessing full rights, indicating a poor Catholic presence in the area. The fact that they were not yet included in competent ecclesiastical territorial units shows that they had been recently built, on which occasion it was customary at the time to request the granting of privileges. The same Nicolae of Laţcu asked for the forgiveness of sins on behalf of those who frequented several parish churches—St. Lawrence's in Covăsânţ, St. Mary's in Seceani, St. Mary's in *Popy*, All Saints' Church in Kerekegyháza, Saint Margaret's in Margita and St. Stephen's in Ermen—without mentioning, however, the position from which he addressed this request.[49] We know that the village of Kerekegyház was the center of the family estate, having entered into their possession in the 13th century.[50]

Interventions with the papacy were also made for the parish under the patronage of St. Michael from Omor, on Bârzava Valley, and for St. Mary's church from Sâncrai and St. Martin's in Sânmartin, villages that were owned by the family of Omor. A family member, Laurenţiu, features in the papal ordeal of 1433 as the patron of these churches, on behalf of which he requested the right to issue indulgences.[51] On this occasion, he also asked that all the sins committed by the parishioners from the church in Omor that year should be forgiven.

The endowment of the founded churches and the donations of land or movable property made to them represented not only the prerequisite of these foundation acts, but also the counter value of services, such as the celebration of memorial ceremonies for the deceased members of the family or the saying of prayers for the immortality of their souls and the souls of their ancestors or heirs. In this respect, the patrons could take along a second priest or a chaplain besides the parish priest, bearing the cost of his maintenance. This happened in the case of the Makófalvi and Telegdi families from the Cenad kin: in 1337, they made a joint donation whereby the Belthembes estate was ceded to the church there, which was dedicated to St. Ladislaus, with the purpose that a monk should ensure the celebration of services for the salvation of their souls and the souls of their parents.[52] During this period, most of the monasteries founded by the members of the Cenad kin were destroyed in the wake of the Tatar invasion and the Cuman uprising, and only Kanizsa Monastery appears to have been running at this time, also under joint possession.[53]

The nobles also manifested their generosity towards other churches besides the patronal ones, particularly towards monasteries. Such a donation (*elemosia*) was made in 1342 by Master Gall of Omor to the Augustine monastery from Şemlacul Mare, which was in the immediate vicinity of his estate and had been founded by King Béla IV before 1270. Through his donation, he made a pledge, in his and his heirs' name, that every year on the feast of St. Thomas the Martyr (Thomas Beckett, to whom the monastery was dedicated), 10 pounds of wheat from his mill in Gătaia and a piglet would be given to it.[54]

As we have seen so far, direct documentary information on the founding of churches is extremely rare: relations of patronage may most of the times be inferred from brief references. Particularly valuable for the period we have studied are the documents drafted when estates were sold or divided; these situations were particularly common during the 14th–16th centuries, a phenomenon that led to the mincing up of the large nobiliary domains and implicitly influenced the institution of patronage. Very many times, these contracts stipulated aspects related to the ownership and use of churches; at other times, we find out merely that the places of worship were the subject of exchanges, sales and donations, much like villages, possessions or utilities also were. Such a situation was encountered, for instance, in the case of the family of Omor. When in 1343, Ladislaus, the son of Master Gall, ceded to his sister Clara and her fiancé, Blasius, the son of Master Pousa of Zeer, pertinences belonging to the Wyuduor estate, the right of patronage over the stone churches from Wyoduvar, Gewr and Grwngudijghaza was also divided, with the mention that if the family should become extinct, they would return to the heirs of Ladislaus.[55] Therefore the right of patronage was not relinquished, but was kept in the extended family. The estate entered the possession of Master Gall through the donation Bari Teodor

of Voiteg made him in 1322, following the marriage of the royal notary to the daughter of the former ban.[56] The donation was reinforced by the king. Seven years later, the same properties were sold by the sons of Teodor of Voiteg to Master Gall.[57] This document makes no punctual reference to the right of patronage, but this can be inferred from the fact that the deed of sale included the churches. On this occasion, the village of Achad, from Timiş County, together with the stone church there, was also remised.[58]

We have similar information in the case of the Bobal family's land ownership. The 1424 document issued by the Chapter of Cenad, regarding the taking into account of this domain, outlines the structure of ownership among the parties involved, namely the Bobal brothers and Dominic, the son of Nicolae of Fanchlaka.[59] At Teremia, they jointly owned a stone church with a tower. Although, as the issuer emphasized, it lacked a roof, services were officiated by the priest from Voiteg.[60] This information about the church from Teremia suggests that it may have been a patronal church, founded as a daughter-house of the church from Voiteg. In the same place, reference is made to another chapel of wood, besides the one in Vareleye, which we have already talked about; this was located on the royal domain from Byka, but had no cemetery.

The Bethlen family, with the domanial center at Ictar, had the right of patronage over the church there; when the estate was divided in 1364 between, on the one hand, Ioan and Petru, the sons of Bethlen, including Mihai, and his nephew, and on the other hand, Nicolae, the son of Dominic, and Martin, the son of Lewkes, their right of patronage was also divided among them in joint heirship.[61]

At Macedonia, which was owned by the eponymous family (whose residence had been built there sometime before 1400, since it was around this date that Nicolae, the son of Petru, yclept Danciu of Macedonia, asked for material aid from his sister Caterina, the wife of Ştefan Himfi of Remetea, for restoring the castle),[62] the same Nicolae requested the pope, in 1422, to grant the right to celebrate services in the chapel of the Holy Trinity that he had built next to the parish church.[63] The pope's answer is very enlightening as regards the function of this chapel, because it allowed the celebration of services in places that were under papal inderdict.[64] Depending on the cause of the interdict, private chapels could be exempted from it, so patrons could continue to benefit from religious services, as in the case above.

In conclusion, we can say that in the 14th and 15th centuries, like in other territories from the Kingdom of Hungary, the noble families from the area between the Timiş Rivers undertook the establishment and maintenance of places of worship on their domanial lands. This effort was not limited to the localities where they had their nobiliary residences, even though these were given special attention through the exceptional rights obtained for the churches or court chapels there, as suggested by the documents in the case of the chapel of the Himfy from Remetea or of the example from Macedonia. These usually also served as a place of interment for the family members. What are suggestive for determining their status as private churches are the possessive pronouns or other formulations that evince the right of ownership over them. Family-owned places of worship often remained in joint ownership for several generations; aside from the symbolic significance of such places of worship, this was also due to material causes, namely the division of important sources of income, such as mills or customs. Regarding the aforesaid documents of

sale and purchase for various estates, including the churches for which there exists no mention of the right of patronage, the question arises whether these places were sometimes regarded as mere material assets located on private estates, which automatically became part of the owner's property even when he did not play the role of a church patron. Albeit few in number, the documentary sources seem to support this idea.[65] From the point of view of the period under analysis, we may notice the multitude of information for the 14th and 15th centuries; towards the end of this period, the data became increasingly scarce. The wealth of information actually coincides with the period of maximum development and dissemination of the Catholic religion in this area, which was followed by a vast phenomenon of village desertion and abandonment, largely due to the Ottoman threat. Many of the settlements mentioned throughout this study were referred to as deserted villages or *predii* in the documents of the 16th century.

❏

Translated into English by Carmen-Veronica Borbely

Notes

1. The problem addressed in this study is part of the author's doctoral thesis submitted to the University of Szeged, on the subject of the nobiliary residences from the territory between the Timiş Rivers.
2. Adrian Andrei Rusu, "Capele şi cetăţi în Transilvania şi vecinătăţile ei în secolele XIII–XIV," *Arhitectura religioasă medievală din Transilvania* 3 (2004): 99–126, a study resumed later, with some modifications, in a monograph on the fortresses of Transylvania and their adjacent territories: Rusu, *Castelarea carpatică. Fortificaţii şi cetăţi din Transilvania şi teritoriile învecinate (sec. XIII–XIV)* (Cluj-Napoca: Editura Mega, 2005), 202–219.
3. We shall cite only the latest work on our area of interest, which is based on the monographs written at the end of the 19th century and the beginning of the next century: Dumitru Ţeicu, *Geografia ecleziastică a Banatului medieval* (Cluj-Napoca: Presa Universitară Clujeană, 2007).
4. Adrian Magina, "Parohiile catolice din Banat în epoca lui Sigismund de Luxemburg," *Analele Banatului* S. N., Istorie-Arheologie 20 (2012): 173–188.
5. István Petrovics, "Nemzetségi monostoraink problematikája," *Acta Universitatis Szegediensis. Acta Iuvenum. Sectio Historica*, 1 (1978): 9–24; Erik Fügedi, "Sepelierunt corpus eius in proprio monasterio. A nemzetségi monostorok," *Századok* 125 (1991): 35–67; Gyula Kristó, "Néhány megjegyzés a magyar nemzetségekről," *Századok* 109 (1975): 953–967, the authors reaching the conclusion that the term kindred monasteries (*nemzetségi monostorok* in Hungarian) does not cover the realities of the period. For an approach from the vantage point of architecture, see a synthesis of the researches conducted so far, with the attending bibliography, in Béla Zsolt Szakács, "A templomok nyugati térelrendezése és a "nemzetségi monostor," kérdése," *Arhitectura religioasă medievală din Transilvania* 3 (2004): 71–98.
6. Kubinyi András, "Plébánosválasztások és egyházközségi önkormányzat a középkori Magyarországon," in Kubinyi András, *Főpapok, egyházi intézmények és vallásosság a középkori Magyarországon* (Budapest, 1999), 269-286; László Blazovich, "Városi plébániák az Alföldön a XIV–XVI. században," in Piti Ferenc, ed., *Magyaroknak eleiről. Ünnepi tanulmányok a hatvan esztendős Makk Ferenc tiszteletére* (Szeged, 2000), 83–98.
7. Márkus Dezső, ed., *Corpus Juris Hungarici*, vol. I, *1000–1526*, Budapest (1899), 37.

8. Petrovics István, "A Duna-Tisza-Maros köz és Temesvár egyházi viszonyai a középkorban. Történelmi vázlat tényekkel és kérdőjelekkel," in Nándor Bárdi, János Fleisz, Judit Pál, eds., *Erdélyi várostörténeti tanulmányok*, (Miercurea Ciuc, 2001), 47. Their large number, compared with the other archdeaconries, was probably due not only to the vaster territory it encompassed, but also to the density of the localities and, implicitly, of the parishes therein.
9. Ferencz Kollányi, *A magán kegyúri jog hazánkban a középkorban* (Budapest, 1906), 52–56.
10. Elemér Mályusz, *Egyházi társadalom a középkori Magyarországon* (Budapest, 2007), 116–118.
11. Magina, *Parohiile*, 178.
12. Kollányi, *Kegyúri jog*, 57.
13. At the end of the 15ᵗʰ century, churches with a tower and a cemetery were worth 15 marks, while those with two towers were valued at 25 marks. Fügedi, "Sepelierunt," 51–52.
14. Ibid., 52.
15. *Documente privind Istoria României*, C, *Transilvania*, vol. XIII, 2, (Bucharest, 1952), 265–267 (no. 303).
16. For this problem, see Rusu, *Castelarea*, 444–456.
17. Interpretations of the document's text have so far differed, depending on how the formula *in circuitu/in intuitu ecclesie* is read. When the document was published for the first time, the authors chose the version *in intuitu*: Pesty, *Oklevelek*; 317 (no. 188), which Ortvay translated as "face to face with the church" in his work on papal tithes, Tivadar Ortvay, *Magyarország egyházi földleírása a XIV. század elején a pápai tizedjegyzékek alapján feltüntetve*, vol. II (Budapest, 1892), 464. Rusu, *Castelarea*, 448; Ţeicu, *Geografia*, 179, Ţeicu, *Cetăţi medievale din Banat* (Timişoara, 2009), 90 and, more recently, Magina, *Parohiile*, 177, 185 adopt the ultimately correct solution *in circuitu*. See also Iván Boronkai, Kornél Szovák, eds., *Lexicon Latinitatis Medii Aevi Hungarici*, vol. II (Budapest, 1991), 119–120.
18. Rusu, *Castelarea*, 448.
19. Ţeicu Dumitru, *Arheologia satului medieval din Banat* (Reşiţa, 1996), 37–47; Ţeicu, *Geografia*, 174–179.
20. Ţeicu, *Arheologia*, 5–20.
21. Lukcsics Pál, *XV. századi pápák oklevelei*, vol. II (Budapest, 1938), 67.
22. Ţeicu, *Geografia*, 195.
23. Ştefan Matei, Ilie Uzum, "Date noi asupra bisericii şi fortificaţiei de la Ilidia," *Acta Musei Napocensis* 9 (1972): 555–559; Alexandru Rădulescu, "Cercetările de la Mănăştiur (jud. Timiş)," *Materiale şi cercetări arheologice* 14 (1980): 579–587.
24. Rădulescu "Cercetările", 579–587. It has been ascertained that the first phase of the fortification dates from the period when the building was in operation or that it was carried out immediately after its abandonment.
25. Ţeicu, *Geografia*, 104.
26. Kubinyi András, "Késő középkori temetkezések a középkori forrásokban," in Ritoók Ágnes, Simonyi Erika, eds., *a halál árnyékában járok". A középkori templom körüli temetők kutatása* [=Opuscula Hungarica VI] (Budapest, 2005), 16; Rusu, *Castelarea*, 448.
27. Adrian Andrei Rusu, George Pascu Hurezan, *Biserici medievale in judeţul Arad* (Arad, 2001), 48.
28. Rusu, Hurezan, *Biserici*, 77 and Fig. 6.
29. Ţeicu, *Banatul montan in evul mediu* (Timişoara, 1998), 175 and Fig. 56.
30. Florin Mărginean, "Biserica romanică de la Tauţ," *Arhitectura religioasă medievală in Transilvania*. IV (2007), 99–100, Fig. 2.
31. Rusu, Hurezan, *Biserici*, 36.
32. Adrian Andrei Rusu, Ileana Burnichioiu, *Monumentele medievale din Ţara Haţegului* (Cluj-Napoca, 2008), s.v. *Streisângeorgiu, Sântămărie Orlea, Densuş*.

33. Kollányi, *Kegyúri jog*, 56. By testament, people could choose another burial place than the church cemetery to whose jurisdiction they belonged, e.g. ancestral burial places, or monasteries.
34. The documents show that in exchange for a certain modest amount, anyone could be interred in "private" cemeteries, sometimes triggering the owners' hostile reactions. See Fügedi, "Sepelierunt," 56.
35. Kollányi, *Kegyúri jog* , 50–51.
36. Ernő Kammerer, ed., *A zichi és vásonkeői gróf Zichy-család idősb ágának okmánytára. Codex diplomaticus domus senioris comitum Zichy de Zich et Vasonkeo*, vol. VIII (Budapest, 1895), 151: "... capellam ligneam cympterium et sepulturam habentem...".
37. Ţeicu, *Banatul*, 122–123.
38. Elemér Mályusz, ed., *Zsigmond-kori oklevéltár*, vol. II/1 (Budapest, 1956), 598 (no. 4834).
39. Magyar Országos Levéltár, Diplomatikai levéltár (Dl.) 47873. The document is not specifically dated.
40. Pesty, *Oklevelek*, 488 (no. 301).
41. Engel Pál, *Magyarország világi archontológiája 1301–1457* (Budapest, 1996), 202–203.
42. Kubinyi, "Plébániaválasztások," 278. The granting of such a privilege seems plausible, if we also consider the other exceptional freedoms the king granted the family, such as *ius gladii* in 1369. Ştefan Pascu, ed., *Documenta Romaniae Historica, C Transilvania* (*DRH*, C), vol. XIII (Bucharest, 1981), 606–607 (no. 394) or the right to hold a fair in Remetea in 1370 – Dl. 70654.
43. Pesty, *Oklevelek*, 488 (no. 301), 511 (no. 312).
44. Magina, *Parohiile*, 180.
45. Magina, "Albertus Archidiaconus Themesiensis. Între cele temporale şi cele spirituale," *Analele Banatului*, Serie Nouă, Istorie-Arheologie 16 (2008): 157, 166–167.
46. *DRH*, C, XI, 235–236 (no. 226).
47. *DRH*, C, XI, 237–238 (no. 228).
48. *DRH*, C, XI, 238 (no. 229).
49. *DRH*, C, XI, 237 (no. 227).
50. Borovszky Samu, *Csanád vármegye története 1715-ig*, vol. II (Budapest, 1897), 273.
51. Lukcsics, *Pápák oklevelei*, II, 101–102 (no. 248).
52. Pesty, *Oklevelek*, 49: ... *possessionem Belthembes (...) communi consensu et pari voto, ob remedium animarum eorum, parentumque suorum ob salutem, ecclesie in honorem sancti Regis Ladislai site seu constitute commisissent, eo modo, quod in eadem heremitam sacerdotali officio fungentem servarent...*
53. The problem of the foundations laid by this family is more complex and its beginnings go back to a period we do not intend to focus on now.
54. Ferenc Piti, ed., *Anjou-kori Oklevéltár*, XXVI, 1342 (Budapest-Szeged, 2007), 64 (no. 30).
55. Pesty, *Oklevelek*, 72–73 (no. 40).
56. Pesty, *Oklevelek*, 31 (no. 26).
57. A transcript in a document from 1390, see Pesty Frigyes, *Krassó vármegye története*, vol. III (Budapest: 1882), 198–208 (no. 128).
58. Pesty, *Krassó*, III, 201.
59. Kamerer, *Zichy*, VIII, 152 (no. 102).
60. Magina, *Parohiile*, 177.
61. Dl. 63123.
62. Pesty, *Oklevelek*, 301–302 (no. 181).
63. Lukcsics, *Pápák oklevelei*, vol. I, 121 (no. 443); *ZsOkl*, IX, 1422, 35 (no. 23).
64. Lukcsics *Pápák oklevelei*, vol. I, 121 (no. 442); *ZsOkl*, IX, 1422, 35 (no. 24).
65. Kollányi, *Kegyúri jog*, 14; Fügedi, "Sepelierunt," 44; Mályusz, *Egyházi társadalom*, 27.

Abstract

Nobiliary Residences and Ius Patronatus in the Tterritory between the Timiş Rivers (14ᵗʰ–16ᵗʰ centuries)

Following the example of the kings as great founders of monasteries, the nobles also resorted to this gesture, which was meant to ensure the immortality of the benefactor and his family. In terms of ecclesiastical organization, these foundations were intertwined with the parish church network. When drawing a parallel between the establishment of monasteries and that of churches, we must take into consideration the economic advantages as well, for churches represented a source of income. Familial churches were founded mostly nearby the nobiliary residences, as the examples from Iobag, Remetea and Vareleye illustrate. Beside these court chapels or parish churches, the nobles also made efforts to raise churches in other villages located on their land. The maximum proliferation of private churches occurred during the 14ᵗʰ–15ᵗʰ centuries; there is very scarce information in this respect in the 16ᵗʰ-century charters.