

---

## TRANSILVANICA

# Avignonese Tithe Collectors and Transylvania Up Until the Middle of the 14<sup>th</sup> Century

ROBERT-MARIUS  
MIHALACHE

---

*This article aims to present diachronically the papal tithe collectors who were active in the Kingdom of Hungary (with implications on Transylvania) up until the middle of the 14<sup>th</sup> century.*

---

**T**HE SUBJECT of the Avignonese tithe collectors in the western European space is not new. In the historiography of the subject, perspectives are quite consistent as regards the functioning mechanisms of the Avignon papacy. This historical stage is discussed in a wide range of materials published in the specialized journals edited by various Western historiographical schools.<sup>1</sup>

However, there are few writings in Romanian historiography<sup>2</sup> that have addressed the Avignon period of the Holy See. This aspect extends to the papal tithe collectors, who are fairly well-known in our historiography. The motivation for choosing this subject rests on the absence, in Romanian historiography, of historical writings

This work was possible due to the financial support of the Sectorial Operational Programme for Human Resources Development 2007–2013, co-financed by the European Social Fund, under the project number POSDRU/159/1.5/S/140863 with the title “Competitive European Researchers in the Fields of Socio-economics and Humanities: Multiregional Research net (CCPE).”

**Robert-Marius Mihalache**

Editor at the External Communication  
Service of Babeş-Bolyai University,  
Cluj-Napoca.

reflecting the activity of the pontifical collectors in the aforementioned region. Therefore, this article aims to present diachronically the papal tithe collectors who were active in the Kingdom of Hungary (with implications on Transylvania) up until the middle of the 14<sup>th</sup> century, in order to show how the Hungarian Angevin monarchy was connected to the directives issued in Avignon.

At the beginning of the 14<sup>th</sup> century, the political context on the European scene was not favorable to the Holy See due to the deterioration of an essential factor that had coagulated the European kingdoms during the 12<sup>th</sup>–13<sup>th</sup> centuries and had found its materialization in the Innocentine conception of *plenitudo potestatis* or “fullness of power.” This fullness of power meant that popes had absolute jurisdictional prerogatives in all matters pertaining to either the temporal or the spiritual sphere. Nevertheless, at the beginning of the 14<sup>th</sup> century, by moving the capital of the Church from Rome to Avignon, the Holy See had limited its powers, irreversibly diminishing that *plenitudo potestatis* by passing “under the protection” of the French royalty.

“The papacy of Avignon” (1305–1378), as many define it negatively, this exile of the popes was substantially different from the era of pontifical hierocracy<sup>3</sup> that had dominated Europe from the late 12<sup>th</sup> century until the beginning of the 14<sup>th</sup> century. Even if the Avignon popes had wished to pursue the universalist ideas of their predecessors, such as Innocent III (1198–1216) and Innocent IV (1243–1254), the main element that was taken over and continued in a “universalist” sense was centralization.<sup>4</sup> However, the Avignon popes<sup>5</sup> carried out this centralization in an economic and fiscal, rather than in a political sense, as it had been the case in the previous centuries.

The Papal Curia in Avignon did not differ essentially from the Roman Curia. The same structural composition had been maintained, the Chancery and the Apostolic Camera<sup>6</sup> being the most important departments thereof. The Apostolic Camera represented the department of the Papal Curia that was responsible for the economic or fiscal centralization of the popes in Avignon. The Apostolic Camera was the *pièce de résistance* on which the holders of the Petrine seat relied in the 14<sup>th</sup> century. The duties of this institution included a series of tasks, of which the most representative were the maintenance of the Church’s patrimony and the management of the papal revenue. Since the 12<sup>th</sup> century, a prelate who was close to the pope had usually been appointed at the head of the Apostolic Camera: this was, as a rule, a cardinal from the Curia, known as the chamberlain or *camerarius* (*camerarius domini papae*).<sup>7</sup>

Regarding the office of *camerarius* during the Avignon period, it should be noted that this pontifical dignity was held by an archbishop or a bishop, not by a cardinal.<sup>8</sup> During the stay of the Petrine seat in Avignon, seven *camerlengos*<sup>9</sup> succeeded at the head of the Apostolic Camera. It could be stated that for every pontificate, there was one *camerlengo*, which would have meant stability and

even efficiency for the Apostolic Camera, but this was not the case because during the pontificate of Clement V (1305–1314), there were three holders of this office, so the balance between the number of Camera leaders and that of the holders of the Petrine See was not perfect.<sup>10</sup>

The *camerlengo* was assisted by a treasurer (*thesaurarius*) and a judge (*auditor*). The Camera also included other clerics (*clerici camerae*), whose number was initially small; later, during the Avignon period, their number grew considerably, also due to the improvement and increase in complexity of the system perfected by the successor of Clement V, Pope John XXII (1316–1334). Before detailing the streamlined system of Pope John XXII and the Transylvanian consequences of the Avignonese policy, let us list the revenue sources of the Holy See during this century.

The most significant amounts for the Church were levied from the census<sup>11</sup> collection, as well as from the gathering of papal tithes, from the beneficial reserve and other church taxes (Peter's Pence<sup>12</sup>—*Denarii Sancti Petri*, the confirmation fee for the bishops<sup>13</sup>—*servitia communia*, the fee for appointment to archiepiscopal functions<sup>14</sup>—*pallium*, or the tax on the first year's profits<sup>15</sup>—*annates*, etc.).

As regards the types of taxes listed above, the focus in our study will fall on papal tithes, specifically on their collection. Papal tithes represented a tenth of the annual revenues of the clergy and those fees were paid by the clerics to the Apostolic Camera via collectors. This is how the institution of the pontifical collector appeared. During this period, collectors were sent by the pope, usually from Avignon, with the mission to collect the papal tithes owed by the clergy from the European kingdoms.<sup>16</sup>

In terms of the structure of the collector's institution, the main collector sent from Avignon was assisted by sub-collectors. The latter were usually clerics from the local dioceses and their role was to help with the collection of tithes from the territory and then hand them over to the papal collector or collectors. Thus, one or more pontifical collectors were sent from the center to the European kingdoms where tithes were levied. They had a fairly extensive area of activity, which was nonetheless limited by the act of entrustment issued by the popes through the Papal Chancery. If the period of collection spanned six years, then two or more main collectors went to a single kingdom and divided the territories among themselves to streamline the collection process. Each collector had sub-collectors. The collected taxes were then deposited in various Italian, especially Florentine, banks which transported the sums to the Papal Camera.

In most cases, the main reason for which pontifical tithes were collected resided in the preparations made for a new crusade to aid the Holy Land.<sup>17</sup> Still, there were also pontifical demands for local crusades, for instance, in support of Spain, a resolution adopted by Calixtus II at the Second Council of the Lateran

in 1123.<sup>18</sup> Almost all the councils, especially the general ones, adopted such decisions meant to assist the Christians in different parts of Europe and, above all, those in the Holy Land. If the situation demanded it, then the *decima* due to the Apostolic Camera doubled, and the time allocated to the collection halved so as to gather a larger amount in a relatively short time. Such a decision was reached by Pope Innocent III in the Fourth Council of the Lateran in 1215.<sup>19</sup> The decision of Pope Innocent III was applicable in all the kingdoms of *Societas Christiana*, hence also in the Kingdom of Hungary, which included Transylvania.<sup>20</sup>

The need to collect tithes for the classical type of crusade could be further seen in the canons adopted at the subsequent general councils, Lyon I (1245) and Lyon II (1274), where no significant changes were made concerning the tithes, the major purpose of the collections remaining the same—*subsidium Terrae Sanctae*. The laws adopted there were also applicable in the Kingdom of Hungary where, in 1275, Pope Gregory X (1271–1276) had mandated Gerardus of Mutina, a *scriptor* and subdeacon, with a mission to collect tithes for six years. It appears that during the same period when Gerardus of Mutina went to the Kingdom of Hungary, there were twenty-seven other collectors in *Societas Christiana*.<sup>21</sup>

**T**HE DIFFERENCE between the action of collecting papal tithes in the Kingdom of Hungary coordinated by Gerardus of Mutina and that of the collectors before him is palpable, on rather solid grounds—in the sense that the register compiled by Gerardus of Mutina has been preserved.<sup>22</sup> However, this register does not reflect the structure of the local Hungarian church, because the amounts were not recorded by diocese and, then, by archdeaconry. The merit of this register is that it reflects the total amounts collected in the Kingdom of Hungary.<sup>23</sup>

As regards the papal tithes collected in Hungary during this period in order to assist the Holy Land, we learn from a later source that these amounts were granted to the King of Sicily (Charles of Anjou, 1266–1285) to strengthen the defense of the monarchy he headed.<sup>24</sup>

Tracing the course followed by the tithe collectors in this region, we may note that the next pontifical collector, who was also the first during the Avignon era, was Cardinal Gentilis of Montefiore, legate *de latere*<sup>25</sup> to the Kingdom of Hungary between 1307 and 1311. His mission to the Kingdom of Hungary took place on two levels: the first one was political and was aimed at the consolidation of Charles Robert of Anjou on the Hungarian throne. The second level was economic and entailed the fact that all the prelates in the kingdom, regardless of the office they held,<sup>26</sup> were obliged to contribute to the legation costs during the period in which the legate *de latere* resided in the Kingdom of Hungary, this legate being entrusted with the mission to collect these amounts.

It appears that only some of the pontifical desiderata were satisfied by Gentilis of Monteflore, the legate *de latere*, who was also a pontifical collector, especially those of a political nature. The economic aspect left a lot to be desired because, six years later, the Apostolic Camera “remembered” the outstanding amounts, and in 1317 Pope John XXII mandated Rufinus of Civinio, Archdeacon of Tolna (*archidiaconus Tollensis in ecclesia Quinqueecclesiensi*) with a mission to collect those taxes.<sup>27</sup>

Rufinus of Civinio activated for three years, during which time he did his best to comply with the directives from Avignon. He had been a close collaborator of the legate *de latere* Gentilis of Monteflore. From the tax records compiled under his direction, we can learn about the collected amounts. He had been sent to the Angevin Kingdom of Hungary with the intent to collect, for the Apostolic Camera, over 1,700 silver marks (*marca argenti*) measured according to the weight in Buda, the equivalent of 417.4 kg of silver.<sup>28</sup> However, the actual amount was much lower, less than 300 silver marks (73.6 kg of silver). The difference had been paid by the debtors to the former legate, but the department responsible for the pontifical finances had not learned about this.<sup>29</sup> Still, Rufinus of Civinio could not return to Avignon with a tiny amount, and to help increase the amount that was to be levied there came the so-called *beneficiorum vacantium*, or the beneficial reserve.<sup>30</sup> In addition to the tithes, the beneficial reserve was yet another important source of income for the Holy See in the 14<sup>th</sup> century. What should be noted from the activity of Rufinus of Civinio in Hungary (1317–1320) is that he fulfilled the desiderata and that his tax register, which has been preserved, includes data relating to the sums paid by a number of Hungarian clerics to the Papal Camera. This register comprises general notations, without giving us the possibility of ascertaining the amounts paid by the clergy in the Diocese of Transylvania.<sup>31</sup>

The next envoys sent by Pope John XXII were Jacobus Berengarii<sup>32</sup> and Raimundus of Bonofato. Their letter of entrustment was issued by the Pontifical Chancery in March 1331,<sup>33</sup> two decades after the adoption of the canons of Vienne (1311–1312), where the collection of new tithes had been enacted by pontifical decree. This delay in the enforcement of the conciliar decisions in the Hungarian territories was not singular.<sup>34</sup>

The document issued by John XXII stated that the pontiff had dispatched Jacobus Berengarii and Raimundus of Bonofato to the Kingdom of Hungary to collect the six-year tithes owed by the Hungarian clergy. However, the most important element in this letter is the fact that the pope granted the two legates papal prerogatives in order that they might make their mission more efficient (“under the letter herein, we grant you and each of you full power so that you may also grant, under our power, the benefaction of absolution, after the custom of the Church, both to the prelates of churches and to other clergymen, lay-

men or monks, from the said country, who are bound by malediction or other churchly castigations...”).<sup>35</sup>

In addition to the letter of entrustment given to the two collectors,<sup>36</sup> the Pontifical Chancery issued, on the same day, several other documents whereby John XXII addressed himself to the Hungarian clergy, urging them to pay the tithe.

During this period, the European political scene was animated by disagreements between Pope John XXII and the German King Louis IV (1314–1347), a Roman-German Emperor since 1328, on account of the fact that the latter was not recognized by the holder of the Petrine throne. These struggles, involving different factions, had depleted the financial resources both of the German royalty and of the Apostolic Camera. To these was added a personal “battle” of the same pope against his own will, as concerns the building of the sumptuous pontifical residence in Avignon.<sup>37</sup> These aspects required a continuous replenishment of the financial reserves.<sup>38</sup> Thus, the amounts that were to be collected from the kingdom led by Charles Robert of Anjou (1301–1342) could not compare with those “contributed” by the western kingdoms, because the local Hungarian church was not as rich. Still, the money coming from Hungary could ensure the continuity of the financial supply to the Apostolic Camera. These may also have been, in our opinion, the possible reasons for the collection of tithes from the Angevin Kingdom of Hungary between 1332 and 1337, even though the official, well-known reason referred to the crusade.

The pope’s insistence began to show results, because substantial collections were made in the entire Kingdom of Hungary, including Transylvania, during the same year. All this information results from the tax records that were compiled by the two collectors and that have been preserved, in one form or another.<sup>39</sup>

Charles Robert of Anjou did not remain indifferent to this extensive action aimed at the collection of significant amounts in the kingdom he ruled, especially in a century when the centripetal forces of the Holy See were no longer so strong.<sup>40</sup> Concrete examples of royal disagreement with the pontifical policies had come from France itself, where King Philip IV, called the Fair (1285–1314),<sup>41</sup> had opposed the hierocratic policy of Pope Boniface VIII (1294–1303), and, at a later date, from the Roman-German Empire, where King Louis of Bavaria had often criticized John XXII. Thus, Charles Robert of Anjou could not have had great confidence in the two envoys from Avignon.

The correspondence between the collectors and the pope had the desired effect, because John XXII requested the Hungarian king to support<sup>42</sup> the two members of the pontifical administration; the latter may have sent the pope information confirming the distrust of the Hungarian royalty towards the Apostolic Camera.<sup>43</sup>

The disagreement or, rather, the anxiety caused by the removal of large amounts from the kingdom was also experienced at the level of the local administration, not only at that of the king. Pope John XXII was forced to reiterate his request for

support to the two collectors, addressing it this time to the local temporal leaders. The Holy See left no room for doubt and attempted to mobilize not only the spiritual factors, but also the temporal ones through the appeal he made both to the king and to the Voivode of Transylvania, Thomas, and then to the Comes of Satu Mare, Paul. The pontifical exhortations were repeated several times.

In order to alleviate the situation or to prove its good intentions to King Charles Robert of Anjou, Avignon ceded to the latter, at the request of the royalty, one third of the amounts collected as papal tithes.<sup>44</sup> This action pacified, to some extent, the clergy of the kingdom and the king. Later, the pope thanked them for their support.<sup>45</sup>

In the third year of the collection (1334), Raimundus of Bonofato passed away in Esztergom. He had coordinated, from the archiepiscopal residence, the collection of tithes in the western parts of the Kingdom of Hungary.<sup>46</sup> The other pontifical collector, Jacobus Berengarii, had acted from Kalocsa, the archdiocese<sup>47</sup> to which the Diocese of Transylvania was subordinated.

John XXII sent a replacement for the deceased collector. Jacobus of Lingris was appointed to replace Raimundus of Bonofato. The pope died that same year and the new holder of the Petrine throne, Benedict XII (1334–1342) confirmed Jacobus of Lingris as collector in Hungary in 1335.<sup>48</sup>

Things were not so efficient in the collecting process even though the collectors had been granted pontifical prerogatives, so Benedict XII recalled Jacobus Berengarii to Avignon. The decision to recall the latter was linked to the suspicions of the Apostolic Camera concerning the embezzlement of the amounts previously collected. It appears that the pope's initiative was not well received by the collector, who was in no rush to return to Avignon.

Seeing that the collectors' mechanism did not operate at the required parameters, the Papal Curia deemed it necessary to supplement their number in the Kingdom of Hungary. This supplementation of the collectors' number was meant to ensure a rearguard, not for security, but for proper control purposes. Galhardus of Carceribus<sup>49</sup> had to verify the information that had incriminated Jacobus Berengarii. Hardly had Galhardus of Carceribus left the Polish territories where he had been active prior to being sent to the Hungarian monarchy, when Benedict XII supplemented the papal forces by another collector, in the person of Petrus Gervasii.<sup>50</sup>

This addition to the number of collectors was made in last year of the collection, 1337, when the six-year period prescribed by the canons adopted at Vienne, in 1312, was supposed to come to an end. At this time, there were four tithe collectors on the territory of the Kingdom of Hungary. The first two, Jacobus Berengarii and Jacobus of Lingris had been replaced and, therefore, removed from office by Galhardus of Carceribus and Petrus Gervasii. The dismissal<sup>51</sup> of the former two had come amid their non-compliance with the

papal orders, which had enjoined that the money collected in Hungary should be sent to the Venice branch of Acciaiuoli Bank.<sup>52</sup> Although the former collectors had been removed from office and recalled to Avignon to account for their inadequate activity, they did not present themselves before Benedict XII. Their gesture confirmed to the Apostolic Camera that its assumptions related to their fraud were probably true.

There is no way of knowing whether the Hungarian Crown had anything to do with this indefinite extension of the delivery of the tithes and their removal from the kingdom, but we can assume that Charles Robert of Anjou was far from thrilled to receive the two new collectors.

The traitors to the pontiff appear to have been in Pécs when the new collectors arrived. The king may or may not have had a direct link with the fact that the former collectors, who had been sent by the Holy See, did not respond affirmatively to the directives coming from Avignon. By the time Jacobus of Lingris died in 1339, Jacobus Berengarii had still not yielded the tithes, nor had he “surrendered” to the pope. Little is known about the fate of Jacobus Berengarii after 1340. Still, through Petrus Gervasii,<sup>53</sup> the final report eventually reached the pope, one year later, together with the register of tithes compiled by Jacobus Berengarii. The action of papal tithe collection trudgily came to an end in the Kingdom of Hungary in 1341, four years after the expected date. According to the register of tithes, over a five year period (1332–1336), there were collected, in the Diocese of Transylvania, around 1,832 silver marks measured according to the weight in Buda (449.7 kg of silver). Of these, 661.5 marks (162.4 kg of silver) had been paid by the archdeaconries and the remaining 1,170 marks (287.3 kg of silver) had been paid by the holder of the Transylvanian diocesan see.<sup>54</sup>

The collections made by Jacobus Berengarii and the other legates sent from Avignon from the middle of the 14<sup>th</sup> century onwards did not end the series of financial actions that were beneficial to the Apostolic Camera: there were also other tithe collection actions in Hungary during that century. However, our study stops at the end of Jacobus Berengarii’s activity in the Kingdom of Hungary and highlights the fact that his mission did not fall within the classical patterns of the pontifical collection institution in this region.

**T**HEREFORE, THE process of papal tithe collection, enacted through conciliar decrees issued both during the 12<sup>th</sup>–13<sup>th</sup> centuries and in the 14<sup>th</sup> century, was a complex action that envisaged the collection of the amounts owed to the Apostolic Camera by the clergy of *Societas Christiana*. The general reason was the crusade, an action that most often failed to materialize, even though the amounts envisaged for it were also collected as tithes. These collections were conducted both in the 13<sup>th</sup> and in the 14<sup>th</sup> centuries, extending, every time, to the Kingdom of Hungary and, implicitly, to Transylvania as well. The



difference was that in the era of hierocracy,<sup>55</sup> the Holy See's centripetal force had left no room for interpretation for the papal envoys, whereas in the 14<sup>th</sup> century, the wishes of "the papacy from Avignon"<sup>56</sup> were not always respected by the collectors themselves, who should have acted in the interest of the Apostolic Camera, even though this was also due to the direct or indirect influence exerted by the local factors involved.

□

(Translated by CARMEN-VERONICA BORBÉLY)

## Notes

1. Jean-Daniel Morerod, "Taxation décimale et frontières politiques en France aux XIII<sup>e</sup> et XIV<sup>e</sup> 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; Amandine Le Roux, "De l'espace diocésain et provincial à la collectorie: une gestion territoriale des espaces fiscaux pontificaux en Lorraine du XIII<sup>e</sup> au XV<sup>e</sup> siècle?," *Annales de l'Est*, 7<sup>th</sup> ser., 63, 2 (2013): 127–157; id., "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; M. Fougères, "Problèmes de transfert: la papauté d'Avignon et ses banquiers," *Mélanges d'histoire sociale* (Paris) 4 (1943): 78–80; Eugène Müntz, "Le luxe à la cour pontificale d'Avignon," *Comptes rendus des séances de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres* (Paris) 41, 1 (1897): 29–32; Bernard Barbiche, "Les procureurs des rois de France à la cour pontificale d'Avignon," in *Aux origines de l'État moderne*, 81–112; Jean Favier, "Temporels ecclésiastiques et taxation fiscale: le poids de la fiscalité pontificale au XIV<sup>e</sup> siècle," in *Journal des savants* (Paris) (1964): 102–127; Mário Farelo, "Les clercs étrangers au Portugal durant la période de la papauté avignonnaise: un aperçu préliminaire," *Lusitania Sacra* 22 (2010): 85–147; J.-P. Kirsch, "La fiscalité pontificale dans les diocèses de Lausanne, Genève et Sion à la fin du XIII<sup>e</sup> et au XIV<sup>e</sup> siècle," *Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique suisse* (Zurich) 2 (1908): 102–113.
2. 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 "George Barițiu" din Cluj-Napoca* 51 (2012): 31–43; Răzvan Mihai Neagu, *Politica beneficală a papalității de la Avignon în Transilvania (1305–1378)* (Cluj-Napoca, 2013), passim; Șerban Tîrcuș, "Antroponimele teoforice în Transilvania în secolele XI–XIV," *Anuarul Institutului de Istorie "G. Barițiu" din Cluj-Napoca* 50 (2011): 15–27; Mihai-Florin Hasan, "Antroponimia clerului din registrul de dijme pontificale pe șase ani [1332–1337] cu privire la Transilvania," *Acta Musei Napocensis* (Cluj-Napoca) 47/2 (2010): 61–79; Victor V. Vizauer, "Transylvanian Anthrotoponymy in the Pontifical Tithes Register for Six Years (1332–1337)," *Transylvanian Review* 21, Suppl. no. 3 (*Scholars in Dialogue: Multidisciplinary Approaches in Dealing with the Past in Transylvania*) (2012): 303–320.

3. Hierocracy is a general term that historically defines the 12<sup>th</sup>–14<sup>th</sup> centuries. This was a period when the pontifical Curia behaved like an empire, subordinating, from a temporal point of view, the majority of the European kingdoms. In a broad sense, hierocracy would mean “ecclesiastical governance,” i.e. the governance exerted by the Roman Church, as an institution that, under monarchical garb, endeavoured to lead Europe in the 12<sup>th</sup>–14<sup>th</sup> centuries. The main feature of hierocracy was centralization. Walter Ullmann, *The Growth of Papal Government in The Middle Ages* (London, 1962), 1–25.
4. Hierocratic centralization, which had reached its institutional maturity under Pope Innocent III, in the late 12<sup>th</sup> century, was guided by the Gregorian thought the 11<sup>th</sup> century. This had been gathered in a document known as *Dictatus Papae*, issued by Pope Gregory VII (1073–1085) in 1075. The document placed the pontifical dignity above all others. The abovementioned Pope Innocent III (1198–1216) had understood this papal superiority to be under God but above the people. Jacques Paul Migne, “Innocentii III Romani Pontificis Opera Omnia,” in *Patrologiae*, vol. 2 (Paris, 1855); Edward Peters, “Lotario dei Conti di Segni becomes Pope Innocent III: The Man and the Pope,” in John C. Moore, *Pope Innocent III and his World* (Cornwall, 1999), 3–24; James M. Powell, *Innocent III—Vicar of Christ or Lord of the World?* (Washington, 1994), 79–156.
5. Some historians uphold the idea that the first Pope of Avignon, Clement V (1305–1314), “tore down the entire edifice” built by the hierocratic popes for so many years, and that downgraded the institution of the Church from the status of *Mater omnium ecclesiarum* to that of a “local church.”
6. 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; Ch. Pietri, L. Pietri, A. Vauchez, M. Venard, and J. M. Mayeur, eds., *Storia del Cristianesimo*, vol. 6 (Rome, 1998), 62–63, 68–71.
7. An important camerarius of the 12<sup>th</sup> century was Cencio Savelli, who held this office between 1188 and 1198; he was subsequently elected pope, under the name Honorius III (1216–1227). It is to him that the important economic work of the 12<sup>th</sup> century is owed—*Liber Censuum Romanae Ecclesiae*. The “Codex of Censius,” in free translation, compiled in 1192, was the most complex work of the time, which gathered together several fiscal documents compiled between 492 (the period of Pope Gelasius) and 1192. In other words, this was an update of the database held by the Holy See on its economic affairs. Paul Fabre, “Étude sur un manuscrit du Liber Censuum de Cencius Camerarius,” in *Mélanges d’archéologie et d’histoire*, vol. 3 (Rome–Paris, 1883), 328–372; Șerban Turcuș, *Sfântul Scaun și românii în secolul al XIII-lea* (Bucharest, 2001), *passim*.
8. Patrick Zutshi, “The Political and Administrative Correspondance of the Avignon Popes, 1305–1378: A Contribution to Papal Diplomatic,” in *Aux origines de l’État moderne*, 371–382; Neagu, 105.
9. The seven *camerlengo* during the Avignon period were: Arnaud de Canteloup (1305–1307), Bertrand des Bordes (1307–1311), Arnaud d’Aux (1311–1319), Gaspert de Valle (1319–1347), Stefano Aldebrandi Cambaruti (1347–1360), Arnaud Aubert (1361–1371), and Pierre du Cros (1371–1377).

10. The Avignon popes were: Clement V (1305–1314), John XXII (1316–1334), Benedict XII (1334–1342), Clement VI (1342–1352), Innocent VI (1352–1362), Urban V (1362–1370), and Gregory XI (1370–1378).
11. The census was the fee paid by the nobles around Rome and throughout the Papal State, by the institutions that were subject only to the pope and by the titulars of the Holy See's vassal kingdoms. Foremost among these was the Kingdom of Sicily. Ian S. Robinson, *The Papacy 1073–1198* (Cambridge, 1990), 268.
12. This was an annual voluntary donation made by believers in the European kingdoms. John William Bowden, *The Life and Pontificate of Gregory the Seventh* (London, 1840), 258.
13. Every new office holder appointed to a diocese had to pay an office confirmation fee to the Apostolic Camera. Malcolm Barber, *The Two Cities: Medieval Europe, 1050–1320* (London, 2004), 112.
14. It was the same for the archbishops.
15. A papal claim on the revenue obtained during the first year from vacant benefices. Gerald Lewis Bray, *Documents of the English Reformation 1526–1701* (Cambridge, 1994), 88.
16. For example, in a single year, 1353–1354, there were 31 tax collectors in various regions of Europe: fifteen in France, two in Britain, six in Central and Eastern Europe, four in Italy, three in the Iberian Peninsula and two in Cyprus. *Storia del Cristianesimo*, 6: 66.
17. Louis Bréhier, *L'Église et l'Orient au Moyen Âge—Les croisades* (Paris, 1928).
18. Jacques Paul Migne, “Paschalis II, Gelasii II, Calixti II, Romanorum Pontificum epistolae et privilegia,” in *Patrologiae*, vol. 163 (Paris, 1854); Giovanni Domenico Mansi, *Sacrorum Conciliorum Nova, et amlissima collectio*, vol. 21, anno 1109–1166 (Paris–Leipzig, 1903), passim.
19. “Cupientes autem alios ecclesiarum praelatos nec non clericos universos et in merito et in praemio habere participes et consortes: ex communi concilii approbatione statuimus, ut omnes omnino clerici, tam subditi quam praelati vigesimam partem ecclesiasticorum proventuum usque ad triennium conferant in subsidium Terrae Sanctae, per manus eorum, qui ad hoc apostolica fuerint providentia ordinati: quibusdam dumtaxat religiosis exceptis ab hac praetaxatione merito eximendis; et illis similiter, qui assumpto vel assumendo crucis signaculo sunt personaliter profecturi.” Giovanni Domenico Mansi, *Sacrorum Conciliorum Nova, et amlissima collectio*, vol. 22, anno 1166–1225 (Paris–Leipzig, 1903), passim; Raymonde Forville, *Latran I, II, III et Latran IV* (Paris, 1965), 20–90.
20. Papal collectors were also active in the Kingdom of Hungary: this was revealed after the conclusion of these missions, when the successor of Innocent III, Honorius III, the one who, let us not forget, was one of the best *camerarii* of the 12<sup>th</sup> century, corresponded with the Hungarian high prelates in 1217. Hence, we may conclude that the collection action may have taken place in 1216. We cannot have a definitive stance on this collection action because the records of tithes from which we might extract specific data concerning the size of the collection have not been preserved. Joseph Avril, “Les institutions de la Societas christiana aux XI<sup>e</sup> et XII<sup>e</sup> siècles: diocèses, pievi et paroisses,” *Mélanges de l'École française de Rome. Moyen Âge, Temps mod-*

ernes 86, 2 (1974): 561–565; Ioan-Aurel Pop, “*Din mâinile valabilor schismatici...*” *Românii și puterea în Regatul Ungariei medievale (secolele XIII–XIV)* (Bucharest, n.d. [2011]), passim; Ioan-Aurel Pop and Thomas Nágler, eds., *The History of Transylvania*, vol. 1 (*until 1541*) (Cluj-Napoca, 2005); Pál Engel, *Regatul Sfântului Ștefan: Istoria Ungariei medievale 895–1526*, trans. Aurora Moga (Cluj-Napoca, 2006); László Fejérpataky, “Pápai adószedők Magyarországon a XIII. és XIV. században,” *Századok* (Budapest)(1887): 497.

21. Fejérpataky, 499–500.

22. *Monumenta Vaticana Hungariae*, ser. I, vol. 1, *Rationes collectorum Pontificiarum: Pápai tizedszedők számadásai 1281–1375* (Budapest, 2000), no. 1, 1–12 (hereafter cited as *MVH*, I, 1).

23. *Ibid.* We learn that during this six-year period, there were collected from Hungary, without Slavonia, about 3,000 silver marks, of which the upkeep of the main collector and of the sub-collectors amounted to more than 620 marks. The largest part of the remainder, more than 2,080 silver marks, was deposited in a bank in Florence, close to the Apostolic Camera.

24. *MVH*, I, 1, no. 1, 6–12. “Unde facta ratione de predictis receptis ad prefatas quantitates mutuatas pro factis regni Sicilie, apparet, quod restant de prefatis decimis Ungarie, Polonie et Slavonie.” After the conquest of the Latin Empire of Constantinople (1204–1261) by the Emperor of Nicaea, Michael VIII Palaiologos, the ambitions of the Holy See concerning Constantinople did not subside. Charles of Anjou, king of Sicily and a vassal of Rome, endeavored once again to become the spearhead of the offensive against the “Greek” Empire of Constantinople, on his return from exile in Nicaea. The conflicts between King Charles of Anjou and Basileus Michael VIII exhausted the financial reserves of both political entities. Rome intervened in these conflicts on the Neapolitan side, and resorted, for the revioration of Sicily, to an infusion of capital collected from the kingdoms of Hungary and Poland by Gerardus of Mutina, between 1275 and 1281. Dimiter Angelov, *Imperial Ideology and Political Thought in Byzantium 1204–1330* (Cambridge, 2007), 25–155; David Jacoby, *Byzantium, Latin Romania and the Mediterranean* (Vermont, 2001), 1–44, 141–201.

25. Leonardo Erriquenz, “I legati Pontifici in Oriente dal 1261 al 1334,” in *Apollinaris Commentarius iuris canonici: Annus XXXVIII* (Rome, 1965), 330; Várszegi Asztrik, Zombori István, and Fraknói Vilmos, “Acta Legationis Cardinalis Gentilis: Gentilis bíbornok magyarországi követségének okiratai 1307–1311,” in *Monumenta Vaticana Hungariae. Vatikáni Magyar Okirattár*, vol. 2 (Budapest, 2000), passim.

26. The amounts owed by the Hungarian clergy were not negligible, but rather burdensome. There were a number of clerics who criticized these taxes, appealing to the Holy See, but to little effect. A vehement critic was the holder of the episcopal see of Transylvania, Benedict (1309–1318), who considered that the sum of 1,000 silver marks he had to pay for a period of three years exceeded his powers and the possibilities of the diocese he was in charge of. All in all, that would have meant that he had to pay over 330 silver marks a year. Jakó Zsigmond, *Erdélyi okmánytár*, vol. 2 (1301–1339) (Budapest, 2004), no. 169, 89; no. 186, 93 (hereafter cited as *EO*).

27. *Documente privind istoria României*, C, *Transilvania, Veacul XIV*, vol. 1 (Bucharest, 1952), no. 252, 259–270 (hereafter cited as *DIR*); *MVH*, I, 1, no. 2, 13–38. August Franzen, *Istoria papilor*, trans. Romulus Pop (Bucharest, 1996), 255–260.
28. According to Bálint Hóman, in the 14<sup>th</sup>–17<sup>th</sup> centuries, the weight of a silver mark in Buda was 245.53 g, 220.98 g of which were pure silver. Although the collectors' records do not mention quantifications in Transylvanian marks too, and even though collections were also made in this diocese, Hóman indicates that a Transylvanian silver mark weighed 206.76 g, 186.09 g of which were pure silver. Hóman Bálint, *Magyar pénztörténet 1000–1325* (Budapest, 1916), *passim*.
29. *EO*, 2, no. 190, 94.
30. *MVH*, I, 1, no. 2, 13. In the 13<sup>th</sup> century, the Holy See adopted a decision whereby the benefices that remained vacant following the death of the holder were to be automatically placed under the authority of the pope. Hence, the right of the Holy See beneficial reserve. This *ius* was resorted to by the Avignon popes mainly in the 14<sup>th</sup> century.
31. Ioan-Aurel Pop, *Români și maghiarii în secolele IX–XIV: Geneza statului medieval în Transilvania*, 2<sup>nd</sup> rev. edition (Cluj-Napoca, 2003).
32. Leonardo Erriquenz, 313; *MVH*, I, 1, no. 3, 39–161.
33. *DIR*, C, *Transilvania, Veacul XIV*, vol. 3, no. 9, 4; *EO*, 2, no. 695, 257.
34. György Rácz, “Az Anjou-ház es a Szentszék 1301-1387,” in *Magyarország es a Szentszék kapcsolatainak ezer éve* (Budapest, 1996), 55–64; *Storia del Cristianesimo*, 729–732. This ample process of tithe collection from the Kingdom of Hungary occurred two decades later. In the neighboring Kingdom of Poland, the collection of tithes ended when the Avignon envoys arrived in Hungary, in 1331. The levying of papal tithes from the kingdoms that were geographically close to Avignon had ended before Andreas of Verulius and Petrus of Alvernia, the two collectors, became active in the Kingdom of Poland, between 1325 and 1331.
35. *DIR*, C, *Transilvania, Veacul XIV*, vol. 3, no. 9, 4; *EO*, 2, no. 695, 257.
36. *EO*, 2, no. 695, 257; *DIR*, C, *Transilvania, Veacul XIV*, vol. 3, no. 12, 6–7. The document states that Jacobus Berengarii was a member of the Benedictine Order and the manciple of the Monastery of Grasse. The other collector, Raimundus of Bonofato, was rector of St. Michael's Chapel in the dioceses of Carcassonne and Limoges, France.
37. Maurice Faucon, “Les arts à la cour d'Avignon sous Clément V et Jean XXII (1307–1334),” in *Mélanges d'archéologie et d'histoire*, vol. 2 (Paris, 1882), 36–83; Yves Renouard, *La papauté à Avignon* (Paris, 2004), 99–105.
38. From the amounts collected by the Apostolic Camera for the classical crusade, a part was allocated to other actions, such as the fight against heresy and against the schismatics, various wars in the Italian Peninsula and the construction of the papal palace in Avignon.
39. The tax records that we know today were transcribed several times and, thus, there appeared some gaps, both as regards the taxpayers' names and the localities where these tithes were collected. Concrete data are missing also as regards the economic aspect.
40. Ernst Kantorowicz, *The King's Two Bodies* (Princeton, 1957), *passim*.
41. Julien Théry, “Philippe le Bel, pape en son royaume,” *L'Histoire* (Paris) 289 (2004): 14–17.

42. *DIR, C, Transilvania, Veacul XIV*, vol. 3, no. 72, 260; *EO*, 2, no. 932, 336, no. 979, 353.
43. *EO*, 2, no. 1011, 364.
44. *DIR, C, Transilvania, Veacul XIV*, vol. 3, no. 90, 270; *EO*, 2, no. 751, 275.
45. *DIR, C, Transilvania, Veacul XIV*, vol. 3, no. 121, 285; no. 122, 285.
46. Here were included the dioceses of: Agria, Pécs, Vác, Győr, Nyitra and Veszprém. These dioceses were suffragans of the Archdiocese of Esztergom.
47. The following dioceses were subordinated to the Archdiocese of Kalocsa: Oradea, Transylvania, Cenad, Zagreb, Bosnia.
48. *RÁCZ*, 65–67.
49. *DIR, C, Transilvania, Veacul XIV*, vol. 3, no. 318, 408; no. 319, 408.
50. *Ibid.*, no. 326, 412.
51. *Ibid.*, no. 362, 439.
52. *Ibid.*, no. 329, 413.
53. Fejérpataky, 516–517; *MVH*, I, 1, no. 4, 410–432.
54. *MVH*, I, 1, no. 3, 90–144; *EO*, 2, no. 1060–1155, 383–419; *DIR, C, Transilvania, Veacul XIV*, vol. 3, no. 56, 122–221; Neagu, 58–64; 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. The archdeaconries mentioned in the tithes register were: Alba (archidiaconatu Albensi), Turda, Ozd, Hunedoara (Hunodiensi), Cluj-Cojocna, Târnava (Keukellev), Tylegd, Dăbâca (Doboka), Solnoc, Crasna (Karazna), Ugocea (Ugacha), Chezdi (Kyzdi), Satu Mare (Zothmar).
55. Agostino Paravicini-Bagliani, *La cour des papes au XIII<sup>e</sup> siècle* (Paris, 1995), *passim*.
56. Bernard Guillemain, “Papauté d’Avignon et État moderne,” in P. Guichard, *Papauté, monachisme et théories politiques*, vol. 1 (*Le pouvoir et l’institution ecclésiastique*) (Lyon, 1994), 79–89.

## Abstract

### The Avignonese Tithe Collectors and Transylvania (Up Until the Middle of the 14<sup>th</sup> Century)

This article aims to present diachronically the papal tithe collectors who were active in the Kingdom of Hungary (with implications on Transylvania) up until the middle of the 14<sup>th</sup> century, in order to show how the Hungarian Angevin monarchy was connected to the directives issued in Avignon. The process of papal tithe collection, enacted through conciliar decrees issued both during the 12<sup>th</sup>–13<sup>th</sup> centuries and in the 14<sup>th</sup> century, was a complex action that envisaged the collection of the amounts owed to the Apostolic Camera by the clergy of *Societas Christiana*. The general reason was the crusade, an action that most often failed to materialize, even though the amounts envisaged for it were also collected as tithes. These collections were conducted both in the 13<sup>th</sup> and in the 14<sup>th</sup> centuries, extending, every time, to the Kingdom of Hungary and, implicitly, to Transylvania as well.

## Keywords

Avignon papacy, tithe collectors, Apostolic Camera, Transylvania